954

the library

GARRETT
THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY

EVANSTON, ILLINOIS

THE RELIGIOUS EDUCATION ASSOCIATION
60475
H-2
7.3
3317
Gift from Henry A. Coe
Garrett Biblical Institute
Evanston, Illinois

EDUCATION AND CITIZENSHIP IN INDIA

BY THE SAME AUTHOR

THE WHITE MAN'S WORK IN ASIA AND AFRICA

A Discussion of the Main Difficulties of the Colour Question

Crown 8vo, 3s. net

"A work full of valuable details and forcible arguments, and one which will command attention in those countries where the colour question presses for solution."—*Journal of the Royal Colonial Institute.*

STOIC AND CHRISTIAN IN THE SECOND CENTURY

A Comparison of the Ethical Teaching of Marcus Aurelius with that of Contemporary and Antecedent Christianity

Crown 8vo, 3s. net

"Mr. Alston displays a breadth of view and a penetrating comprehension that render his volume a valuable stimulus for thought."

Review of Theology and Philosophy.

MODERN CONSTITUTIONS IN OUTLINE

An Introductory Study in Political Science

Crown 8vo, 2s. 6d. net

"Mr. Alston has done a useful piece of work, which, in its brevity and clearness, is a model of the expository functions of a Professor."—*Spectator.*

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.

39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.

EDUCATION AND CITIZENSHIP IN INDIA

BY

LEONARD ALSTON

Director of Non-Collegiate Students in Economics and History, Cambridge
Formerly (1904-5) temporary Professor at Elphinstone College, Bombay
Litt.D., Trinity College, Melbourne

LC94
I4A5

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.
39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON
NEW YORK, BOMBAY, AND CALCUTTA
1910

All rights reserved

Garrett Biblical Institute
Evanston, Illinois

JAN 18 1928

TO
MY FELLOW STUDENTS
AT
FITZWILLIAM HALL

LENDING

157213

PREFACE

THIS study of our Indian educational policy in its relations to Indian social and religious conditions, and of its effects in the sphere of political activities, owes its appearance in its present shape to the wording of the thesis propounded for the Maitland Prize (Cambridge, 1909). The adjudicators asked for dissertations on "the teaching of experience in India on the question how far secular education can foster a sense of duty." The question thus propounded can hardly be said to have received an answer in this volume; but the fact that it was asked in the above form will account to some extent for the attention devoted to certain controversial topics which might otherwise have been treated more cursorily.

For the space of sixteen months I was myself a cog in a wheel of the Indian educational machine —a rather mutinous cog in a very blundering machine—and cannot therefore be charged with handling matters of which I have no first-hand knowledge, or in which I have felt no more than a remote academic interest. The general plan of the essay has, however, taken me in places some-

what further afield; and in those chapters where I discuss questions lying outside my special province I trust that it will not be counted against me that I have retired as far as possible behind the scenes in order to quote freely from others. I have endeavoured at every stage to indicate (wherever they have attracted my notice) the existence of views different from my own, even when I find such views very unconvincing; and thus it is that certain portions of the essay must appear as little more than a closely woven tapestry of quotations culled from all those who seem able to speak from first-hand information.

As regards sources: besides the various Governmental publications dealing with the subject—Statistical Abstracts, Quinquennial Reviews of Education, Moral and Material Progress of India, Reports of University Commissions, etc.—I have used the histories of Indian education by Sir R. Lethbridge, Mr. F. W. Thomas, Dr. S. Satthianadan (for Madras), and Dr. W. I. Chamberlain. With these may be put the speeches of Lord Curzon, edited by Sir T. Raleigh. Most books about India, whether by missionaries, by political theorists, by ex-administrators, or by sightseers, touch incidentally on the subject of the essay; and I have endeavoured to read the relevant parts of all publications of this kind that have come under my notice. In addition I have read a con-

siderable amount of Indian National Congress literature and a number of political pamphlets written by Indians. Perhaps my chief indebtedness, however, has been to periodical literature—a fact evidenced by the quotations throughout the volume.

Wherever possible I have indicated the sources of my information, as well as the writers' special qualifications to deal with Indian topics.

My personal thanks are due to Mr. H. J. Wolstenholme for a number of valuable suggestions.

LEONARD ALSTON

Fitzwilliam Hall,
Cambridge,
March 1910.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

Nature of the Inquiry. Difficulties with regard to (1) the selection of sources, and (2) their interpretation . *pages* 1–13

CHAPTER II

Rough sketch of the general environment (social, philosophical, and religious) within which our educational system works, and of such peculiar features of that environment as have a special bearing on our problem *pages* 14–56

CHAPTER III

General features of higher education in India. Defects of the system when it is considered either in itself, or in relation to the surroundings from which the students come, or in relation to their after-careers. The extent to which it can be described as "secular." Various projects for increasing the religious elements in it . . *pages* 57–109

CHAPTER IV

Collation of general impressions as to the effects of the system as manifested in the characters of educated India. Difficulty of separating out the interacting effects of multifarious conflicting causes, and of weighing the results of our investigation . . . . *pages* 110–143

CHAPTER V

More particular consideration of the political activities of educated Indians and their social and political aspirations. Relation of these to the education question. Conclusion . . . . . *pages* 144–217

INDEX . . . . . *pages* 219–222

EDUCATION AND CITIZENSHIP IN INDIA

CHAPTER I

THE investigation we are here undertaking is an investigation into facts—contemporary facts of the same order as the social historian is accustomed to handle when dealing with the records of the past. Our concern is primarily with what is and what has been in India; only secondarily with what ought to be. Our main business is not theorizing; though the chief inducement in undertaking such researches as this may well be the practical aim of laying broad and firm the bases for theories in accordance with which our educational policy in India may be moulded in the future. While we refrain then, as far as may be, from over-hasty theorizing and from needless dealing in precepts and advice, our first task is to discover, and give their proper weight to, such effects as are definitely traceable to the existing educational system. But for this purpose we need a clear idea, firstly, of the

general social and moral conditions that govern life in India; we need, secondly, to know thoroughly what are the general characteristics of the educational system which works in this environment, and its special shortcomings when considered as a training in citizenship; and we need, thirdly, to consider what other forces are simultaneously at work moulding the life and character of the people.

All these are questions of fact. And thus, our primary concern being not with ideals, ethical or religious, but with the affairs of ordinary life, we have to begin our task by asking where we may expect to find our most useful material.

Were the question before us that of the influence of Western culture on Oriental ideals, we should turn at once to examine all the published utterances of Indians that we could collect, and scrutinize them for evidence of contact with European thought. We should set to work to analyse those composite products of Christianity and Orientalism, the Brahma Samaj, the Arya Samaj, the Radha Swami creed, and kindred syncretistic offshoots of nineteenth-century conditions,[1] and

[1] "All these schools have certain affinities, they are all eclectic, they are all influenced by Christianity for attraction or repulsion, all unite to exalt the Hindu genius, and all adopt Christian expressions and organization" (Mr. J. Kennedy, I.C.S., "The Tendencies of Modern Hinduism," *The East and the West*, April 1905).

endeavour to weigh how far they give us mere restatements of Hindu thought in Christian garb, and how far they are signs of a genuine Europeanization and Christianization of Hindu ideals.

Such investigation has an intense fascination of its own. But it is not precisely the practical problem which we have to face. It is closely bound up with it, so closely that in handling the one we must continually touch on the other. But among peoples like the Indian, never accustomed to correlate closely religion and ethics, theory and practice, abstract thought and positive action, it is possible, to a much further degree than among ourselves, for theories and ideals to evolve and flourish in advance even of the suggestion that life should in earnest be modified by them. Hence the special difficulty of drawing practical inferences from the study of Hindu publications. In the West practice may lag lamentably behind precept. But the inconsistency is felt. Precept is always *intended* to affect practice. In the East it may be otherwise. The life of thought may be so divorced from the concrete world that devout thinkers feel happy in carrying their speculations onwards to triumphantly satisfying conclusions, while they ignore the baser things of the material world, unharassed by the consciousness of moral shortcomings.

From the standpoint of the typical Oriental we

Western folk are probably to be accounted guilty of extraordinary intellectual confusion in blurring together ethics and religion, two spheres of thought between which the bulk of mankind, outside Christendom, sees no necessary connection.[1] Religion, to him, concerns itself primarily with a mental attitude, a particular outlook on the Universe; secondarily with some more or less definite

[1] This and similar statements in the following pages must of course be taken as very rough-and-ready generalizations, though sufficiently accurate to serve the purpose of the ordinary Western reader. They will be very far indeed from winning the assent of the student of esoteric Hinduism. Indeed, an Indian critic, Pt. T. K. Laddu, reading this passage, protests that the very contrary is true. "To the Hindu" (he says) "Ethics and Religion are the same." This dictum however may, I think, be quite fairly re-stated *for Western readers* thus: What the Indian treats as ethics differs so greatly from our idea of ethics that it can be identified with his religion, while ethics as we conceive it is practically unrelated to his view of religion. "The author" (adds this critic in the same note) "seems to have confused between the *identity* of ethics and religion as recognized by the Hindu, and the absence of ethics as such—divorced from religion, as conceived by the author." A little further on (p. 9) he annotates the quotation from Professor Sayce: "This remark is true,—because the fundamental conceptions of soul, God, and the Universe are entirely different." These differences I believe to be so great that I see no reason why the views set out in the following chapters, even though repudiated *in toto* by the philosophical Hindu, should not be approximately just as regards the impression they make on Western readers; and as I consider my function here to be that of passing on for the benefit of the general reader the impression that Hinduism makes on the English observer, and not that of interpreting Hindu philosophy with philosophic accuracy (for which task I possess no qualifications), I think these chapters need not, when the limitation of their purpose is realized, be in any way misleading.

explanatory scheme of the Universe, a cosmology. Both of these may, for the logical Oriental, have some bearing on the conduct of life. But the conclusion of his theologizing may be nothing but the clear recognition of the futility of action, of the indifference of the Universal Soul to morality, of the wisdom of accepting without a struggle the whole of one's instincts and passions as one finds them.

Yet nowhere, it is safe to say, is man so constituted that theory and practice can be completely sundered. It is a matter of degree. The hard-headed Westerner, with his confident belief in the reality of the concrete world around him, tends, when in earnest, to be earnest about what he does rather than what he thinks; and yet he remains conscious that theology cannot be wholly divorced from life. The metaphysical Oriental, to whom his physical environment is but a shadowy dream and his own personality a diabolical delusion,[1] tends, equally naturally, to turn all his earnestness into clarifying his outlook on the world and purifying his philosophy; yet he, too, must assuredly in some degree find his own conduct

[1] Cf. "The Indian view of man makes his personality a kind of disease, the ultimate source of all his misery and weakness, so that the highest aim of human life is to get rid of personality altogether, and be lost in the impersonal being of the Infinite" (Bishop Whitehead of Madras, "The Future of Indian Christianity," *The East and the West*, January 1905).

modified by his speculations and the practice of his neighbours influenced by his way of expressing the discoveries he has made in what is to him the world of ultimate realities.

Theory and practice must intertwine. Expression of abstract theory is itself a practical act, and must, however feebly, influence all the other provinces of life. Even to the Hindu saint, to whom the ideal of life is absolute passivity, and inertia appears more admirable than the most beneficent activity, the teaching of European morality can not be a matter of indifference. To his mind, we who are always dealing with concrete problems, with health and wealth and the other deceptive allurements of this transitory world, we who tempt our weaker brethren into accepting the Here and the Now as the Real, may quite reasonably appear as children of the Evil One.

We must therefore make sure, to begin with, that we have some grasp of the general principles underlying native Indian ethics, as well as some idea of average Indian practice. We need the sympathetic imagination in approaching our topic so as to be able to think ourselves into the Oriental's moral position, in order to judge what effects might be expected from the coming to India of the wisdom of the West, before we attempt from simple inspection of observable social phenomena to say what has happened.

But we need also—and chiefly—masses of concrete fact. For the question we are asking ourselves is not primarily what ought to happen, but what has happened.

Yet it is by no means easy to point out whence we are to gather the material we need. For, as Lord Cromer points out in the introductory chapter of his *Modern Egypt*, there are serious difficulties to be faced by the unofficial inquirer whose task it is to get at the truth about contemporary happenings in a semi-civilized country. "English opinion," he writes, "has in such cases to deal with a condition of society with which it is unfamiliar. It is disposed to apply arguments drawn from English or, it may be, from European experience to a state of things which does not admit of any such arguments being applied without great qualifications. The number of persons who possess sufficiently accurate information to instruct the public is limited, and amongst those persons it not unfrequently happens that many have some particular cause to advance, or some favourite political theory to defend. Those who are most qualified to speak often occupy some official position which, for the time being, imposes silence upon them. There is, therefore, no certain guarantee that inaccuracies of statement will be corrected, or that fallacies will be adequately exposed."

§ 2. But though our main concern is not with theories and ideals, we must not be too narrowly pedantic in our use of the term "facts." It will not forward our investigation, for instance, to confine our attention to information that can be tabulated in statistical shape, or to evidence that can be put forward in a minutely detailed form such as would make it acceptable in a court of law.

For one thing, in the solution of such a problem as ours—the question how far, if at all, our educational system has altered Indian public morality for the better—the use of criminal statistics is especially to be deprecated. Such statistics, in all countries, are most misleading; as changes in the figures may be the consequence, not of changes in actual criminality, but of changes in the law, in the methods and personnel of the magistrates and police, and in postal, telegraphic and railway communications; though changes in the moral standards of the classes who aid or hinder the administrators of the law count also for much. These difficulties are felt with peculiar intensity in India, where native officials live in a state of perpetual anxiety about the way in which their superiors will look at their reports,[1]

[1] "The Secretariat measures the efficiency of all officers by a system of averages: it expects an *average* number of murders, rapes, and thefts in a district. If the returns of crime are above the average the District Superintendent of Police is inefficient,

and where public opinion is not and cannot be expected to be very sensitive to miscarriages of justice, since the usual "punishment" for delicts is nothing more than a temporary sojourn in quarters where the criminals are better fed and treated than they can hope to be outside.[1]

We must rely almost entirely on mere expressions of opinion; preferably of course on the views of well-informed administrators, but also on the statements of the clergy, the Indian Press, and native and Anglo-Indian residents who may seem to be in more than usually close touch with sections of Indian life and Indian public opinion. But all of these are likely to speak with some degree of bias. The officials are naturally desirous that their system and its results should appear in the most favourable light. Pulpit utterances are

since he has allowed crime to become rampant; if he makes a smaller return he is idle, for he has failed to detect crime. In the same way a Civil Surgeon must not perform less than an average number of major operations in the year, and in his report upon the management of the jail must not show more or less than an average number of punishments inflicted on the prisoners" (Mr., now Sir, T. Morison, *Imperial Rule in India*, 1899, p. 81). "A great deal of mischief is caused by the requirements of the Government as to a high average of detection. It is hard to see how this can be dispensed with; but it leads to keen competition between districts, divisions, and police-stations, and naturally makes police subordinates anxious to obtain convictions by all means, especially as they are called to account if they do not come up to the mark" (Letter by an ex-police officer in the *Spectator*, 20 Nov. 1909).

[1] On this point see, for instance, Mr. A. P. Smith's "Our Criminal Population," *The Indian Review* (Madras), April 1905.

likely to confuse realized with anticipated results ;[1] and, like all the other unofficial sources of information, to deal in ill-informed and confusing comparisons between the actualities of the present (as understood by the witness) and ideal views of what ought to be in every Christian country, what is the case in nominally Christian countries, or what was the case in India before English influence came to be felt.

As regards the difficulty of getting at the Oriental's own point of view and of rightly estimating the value of any Oriental opinions that may be adduced, we may perhaps quote Lord Cromer again : "I have lived too long in the East" (he writes) [2] "not to be aware that it is difficult for any European to arrive at a true estimate of Oriental wishes, aspirations, and opinions. . . . I was for some while in Egypt before I fully realized how little I understood my subject ; and I found, to the last day of my residence in the country, that I was constantly learning something new. No casual visitor can hope to obtain much real insight into the true state of native opinion. Divergence of religion and habits of thought ; in my own case ignorance of the ver-

[1] Compare, e.g., Bishop Welldon's remarks on moral progress, quoted elsewhere (p. 138), with his dictum : "It is generally admitted that secular education has proved a lamentable failure" (quoted by Dr. Duncan, *The Asiatic Quarterly*, January 1902).

[2] *Modern Egypt*, 1908, p. 6.

nacular language; the reticence of Orientals when speaking to anyone in authority; their tendency to agree with anyone to whom they may be talking; the want of mental symmetry and precision, which is the chief distinguishing feature between the illogical and picturesque East and the logical West, and which lends such peculiar interest to the study of Eastern life and politics; the fact that religion enters to a greater extent than in Europe into the social life and laws and customs of the people; and the further fact that the European and the Oriental, reasoning from the same premises, will often arrive at diametrically opposite conclusions, — all these circumstances place the European at a great disadvantage when he attempts to gauge Eastern opinion. Nevertheless, the difficulty of arriving at a true idea of the undercurrents of native opinion is probably less considerable in Egypt than in India. Notably, the absence of the caste system, and the fact that the social and religious fabric of Islamism is more readily comprehensible to the European mind than the comparatively subtle and mystical bases of Hinduism, diminish the gulf which in India separates the European from the native, and which, by placing a check on social intercourse, becomes a fertile source of mutual misunderstanding."

He further quotes Professor Sayce: "Those who have been much in the East and have tried to mingle with the native population know well how utterly impossible it is for the European to look at the world with the same eyes as the Oriental. For a while, indeed, the European may fancy that he and the Oriental understand one another; but sooner or later a time comes when he is suddenly awakened from his dream, and finds himself in the presence of a mind which is as strange to him as would be the mind of an inhabitant of Saturn."[1]

Nor can we separate out with any confidence causes and effects. There are too many causes working together simultaneously, and too many complicated effects. Even if we could sum up in concise symmetrical paragraphs the amount of the moral and material progress of the people of India, we should still remain utterly unable to assign their respective weight to the new system of Western education as a whole; the secular nature of the system; the vernacular Press (as a rival as well as an offshoot of the system); the activity of missionaries outside the system; the introduction of an orderly, altruistic, but (to the Indian) soullessly impersonal Government; the mere contact with Western ideas through Western literature and Anglo-Indian activities.

[1] *The Higher Criticism and the Monuments*, 1894, p. 558.

As we study the various influences simultaneously at work, reinforcing and counteracting one another with bewildering complexity, we realize that there is no simple *a posteriori* method of disentangling their effects. We can only attempt so to analyse the interacting forces, as to throw such light on the question of what is to be accounted most significant and important in each case, as may make it possible for students of the problem to arrive more or less confidently at conclusions, less flagrantly erroneous perhaps than mere *a priori* conclusions, but still far from unanimous. For examination of results can do little more, in this as in all other complex social and economic problems, than modify opinions previously formed by deduction from generally accepted views concerning the essential requirements of human nature and its universal tendencies.

CHAPTER II

§ 3. HOW much do we expect that an educational system can achieve in one or two generations in a nation, or rather a congeries of nations, like the Indian?

"Fifty years is a very short period of novitiate for a country fast-bound in prejudices which are rooted in religion and hardened by immemorial custom—a country which is divided against itself, not so much because it consists of diverse regions each inhabited by a people distinct in race and in language, but because each of these peoples is, in fact, a compost of separate nations, which are intermixed on the soil, but pursue entirely separate existences."[1]

And these three hundred millions—in round numbers—seven times the population of the British Isles—how are they distributed among different classes and different occupations? The answer is short and simple: all but a fraction, which it would be hardly an exaggeration to describe as numerically negligible, are village

[1] Sir Bampfylde Fuller, "Sentiment and Indian Policy," *The Nineteenth Century*, December 1907.

peasants, living but a very little way above subsistence level, and doubly impervious to new ideas—firstly as members of self-sufficing village communities,[1] and secondly as members of mutually exclusive castes (groups, that is, the members of which are cut off from the members of other groups by strict rules with regard to dietary and marriage, and obey ceremonial codes which relieve them of nearly all the effort of individual thought).

There are practically no middle classes. There are comparatively few cities where the bulk of what corresponds to our middle classes live—lawyers, merchants, and minor officials. The aristocratic classes we may for the present neglect.

[1] "The village community, originating either in colonisation by families, or in the necessity of mutual protection, is, or everywhere tends to be, the social unit in India, and as such to become a small world in itself, a microcosm, paying its way either directly by its land or by the produce thereof. So that, in respect to education under social influence, the medium to be pierced before inherent aptitudes can be fully developed, or examples from outside can be assimilated, is not merely the traditional devotion to old custom which is characteristic of all peasantry as compared with the citizen of the busier atmosphere of a town, but also the exclusiveness and jealousy of a self-sufficing community" (Mr. J. A. Baines, C.S.I., "Popular Education in India," *Journal of the Statistical Society*, June 1894). "It is a commonplace of commonplaces in regard to India to say that it is a land of villages. It is this fact, no less than the tenacity of their minds and the elusiveness of their thoughts, that has made it appear so often as if messages conveyed to the people of this land were writ on water" (Rev. N. Macnicol, "Spiritual Forces in India," *Contemporary Review*, September 1909).

Note also that we have not yet attempted to educate these masses: not more than one boy in four of school-going age, and one girl in thirty, are receiving the barest rudiments of elementary instruction. Nor is it easy to see how education is to be extended to the masses. For education demands money; money means taxation; and already the Indians cry out that they are the most heavily taxed people on the face of the globe. The cry is not true to fact if we compare population with Government revenue. Indeed, the reverse rather is true. India is one of the most cheaply governed and lightly taxed countries in the world. But if we compare tax payments with average incomes, then the statement may have some value. In any case, the Indian feels and resents the tax revenue that we raise from him for his benefit; and therefore we scarcely dare tax more heavily than we do for purposes so little in consonance with his views as elementary education of a Western type.[1]

[1] "Not many years ago the Government were trying to drive the Indian population to take elementary education, and the people would not have it. He did not think he was exaggerating when he said that in the country districts, as opposed to the towns, it was the constant efforts of the Government through its educational and civil officers to impart elementary education that were in a large measure responsible for such progress as had been achieved in elementary education. He did not mean to assert that Government agency had been the only agency for the support of popular education, nor that at the present moment popular education was looked upon with indifference by the

§ 4. Moreover, those classes in India that on general principles (hazily grasped and very imperfectly understood) are inclined to urge increased expenditure on Education are still, like the mass of their fellow-countrymen, exceedingly prone to suspicion of the genuineness of Government intentions whenever educational reforms are sug-

people. On the contrary, there was a larger demand for education than could be supplied by existing educational institutions and authorities. It was largely a question of funds" (Speech of Mr. Yusuf Ali, I.C.S., reported in *The Asiatic Quarterly,* April 1906). "Where there is no effective demand for education, or, as in India, a demand for it only amongst a small minority, the part that can be played by system or by State initiative or aid is insignificant, and its results are no more than an excrescence or parasitic growth on the life of the community" (Mr. J. A. Baines, C.S.I., in the *Journal of the Statistical Society*, June 1894). Compulsory education of a very elementary type, for boys under twelve and for girls under ten, has, however, been introduced into the native state of Baroda. Mr. H. D. Kantavala, who was responsible for bringing the education law into effect there, says that "the amount of cost is calculated at the rate of four rupees per child per annum for rural districts; for cities, it will be about 50 per cent more. The city of Bombay will therefore require from six to eight lakhs of rupees. The cost of compulsory education for British India will come to about 10 per cent of the State revenue" (*East and West*, Bombay, August 1905). In the next number of the same periodical (September 1905), Mr. K. Natarajan puts the amount rather higher—at ten millions sterling. [To make Mr. Kantavala's statement more available for purposes of comparison, it may be pointed out that the average income of the population of India seems to be between twenty and thirty rupees per annum; in England the corresponding average is between forty and fifty pounds. It should be noted that most elementary school teachers in India seem to receive about the same average pay as a coolie,—a circumstance which makes neither for efficiency in the teacher nor for reverence for learning in the pupils.]

gested. They realize the good that they themselves have gained from what seems to us a very inadequate educational programme, and are rather disposed to magnify it. They realize, also, that administrative officials are inclined to advocate those changes which add to the powers of the official class, and believe them to be averse from calling into being a larger number than necessary of those who, being educated, would be less docile and submissive subjects.[1]

Their advocacy, moreover, is almost entirely given to the cause of "higher" and not of elementary education; and this means that it is—to some extent—a class demand.

§ 5. We note, moreover, that the people of India are as a people miserably poor. How has this come about?

The Indian agitator declares that it is a consequence of our *régime* of grinding taxation—

[1] "It is very difficult to carry out substantial reforms in Higher Education in India, because of the suspicion that we encounter among the educated classes, that we really desire to restrict their opportunities and in some way or other to keep them down" (Speech of Lord Curzon at Simla, 20th September, 1905). For an instance, take the following, from a very moderate and able review:—"Of late there has been considerable outcry against the present system of education imparted to our young men at schools and colleges. The Government and its adherents never lose an opportunity to have a fling at it, and lay the whole blame of the present unrest on its shoulders. This cry is palpably interested and scarcely deserves any notice" (Mr. N. H. Setalvad, *The Indian Review*, March 1908); cf. also the quotations p. 61, n. 3, and p. 87, n. 1, *infra*.

taxation necessitated more especially by the high salaries and unjust pensions[1] of English officials.

Our first reply to this may seem of a brutally harsh character. The total of taxation has been decreasing since the beginning of the British occupation, and is now much less than in the days of the Mogul rulers.[2] (The Indian agitator will

[1] Indian orators are perpetually talking of these pensions as an especially unjust "drain" on the country. They are, however, nothing but deferred salary, and a necessary part of the demand-price to be paid by Government if it desires a reasonably competent set of English subordinates. As it is, the price is hardly high enough to attract the best possible candidates—noticeably so in the educational service, where the terms offered are not markedly different from those in the civil service. (It may, of course, be argued that an English service is not required, native ability being quite sufficient for all requirements. The answer to that plea will be found throughout the remainder of this essay. See, however, especially pp. 173–183.)

[2] "The total increase in the gross land revenue during the past fifty years has been 60 per cent., measured in rupees; though, as the gold value of the rupee has fallen from 24d. to 16d., the increase, if measured in gold, is less than 6 per cent. Taking the increase at 60 per cent., it has been concurrent with a very much greater increase in the value of the gross agricultural yield in consequence of the extension of cultivation, of the rise in prices, of increased irrigation facilities, and of the introduction of new staples. For instance, in the Punjab the amount of the land revenue, stated in rupees, has increased by 80 per cent. in the fifty years. But as the cultivated area has increased by 100 per cent., the assessment per acre is actually diminished. As wheat has risen in value by 100 per cent., a given money assessment now represents a very much smaller portion of the produce than in 1858" (*Memorandum on Indian Administration*, 1909. [Cd. 4956]).

It is worth noting that the tax about which there has been perhaps the greatest outcry is the Salt Tax. This tax fulfils the same function as the English tobacco and alcohol Duties: it

sometimes admit the decrease; but he accompanies the admission with bitter invective against the machine-like soullessness of our system, in making no adequate distinction between fat years and lean, a distinction which any "paternal" Government would be sure to make.[1]) But even if the total of taxation had remained stationary, still the fact would supply no explanation of the people's long-continued poverty; for the long continuance of the tax-gatherer's demands places them practically on a par with such other handicaps as infertility of the soil, which never prevent a resolute population from rising—in the long run—out of poverty into wealth. Much the same may be said also with regard to the recurrent famines. A single famine, such as that which afflicted Ireland in the 'forties, is a disaster against which a nation cannot be expected to have taken precautions. But droughts, recurring at irregular intervals of no great length, are part of the normal order of events in India, and should be

raises a contribution from those classes whom it would be useless to attempt to tax directly. Its gross annual yield since 1907 is somewhat over £3,000,000; which is equivalent to a poll tax of about 2½d. per head per annum. "Salt is now far cheaper in India as a whole than it was fifty years ago, or at any earlier stage of Indian history" (*ibid.*).

[1] This mechanical harshness of our Government is currently very unjustly exaggerated. For some very striking instances of gentle paternalism the reader is referred to Sir Bampfylde Fuller's article, "Quo Vadis?," in *The Nineteenth Century* for April 1909.

allowed for in the same manner as the changes of the seasons, seed time and harvest, are allowed for by all provident populations. Long-continued national poverty is not a misfortune for which it is possible to pity a nation as one pities a country which is desolated by an earthquake or crushed by undeserved aggressions of more powerful neighbours. We may pity individuals born within the poverty-stricken nation. But a nation, as a whole, becomes automatically—in the long run—as rich as it resolutely makes up its mind to be. A people which *will* not remain poor adjusts the growth of its numbers to the growth of its economic opportunities. No concerted action is requisite. Those members of the nation that consider their economic circumstances such as to make a satisfactory life for their children impossible or uncertain, postpone marriage and refrain from having children until circumstances change. The "selfish" discontent and prudential action of large groups quickly affects the rate of increase. A reduction in special classes of labour thus comes about automatically, and the average income within the class begins to rise until equilibrium is again restored at a higher wage level than ruled before.

The population of India, taken in the mass, has no higher standard than that of bare subsistence. Speaking in rough generalization also,

we may say that most people in India begin the conscious part of their life-career already married. This is the custom, maintained by tradition and reinforced by religious sentiment; for it is counted a shame, more especially in the higher castes, for a girl to grow to womanhood unwedded;[1] and the husbands chosen are (naturally) also for the most part children, or at least mere

[1] "According to Baudhana, a girl who is unmarried when she reaches maturity is degraded to the rank of a sudra (servant caste), and her father is held to have committed a grave sin in having neglected to get her married" (*Indian Census Report*). "The last and most important factor and the primary basis of early marriages are the religious precepts given by the Brahman, whose watchword is: 'The father, mother, and elder brother of a girl go to hell should they see her attain her puberty in their family'" (Sirdar Arjan Singh, "Early Marriages in India," *The Asiatic Quarterly*, October 1905).

There are several distinct aspects to this early marriage question which call for separate investigation.

There is, firstly, the health question—Do the children of these early marriages show any physical inferiority?

There is, secondly, the question of child-widows. Vast numbers of Hindu girls are accounted widows before they have known anything of married life. These widows are subjected to lifelong penances and are practically debarred from re-marriage. Numbers of them are said to fall away into immorality.

There is, thirdly, the common Hindu defence of the system—that a system of early and universal marriages reduces prostitution and sexual immorality. Against this must be set what is said above about child-widows, and also the fact that Hindu custom sometimes permits superfluous females to be dedicated by their parents in childhood to the Goddess of Lust—i.e. to a life of prostitution. The amazed comments of Indian readers on the divorce news of English papers would suggest, however,—though not conclusively—a relative superiority of Indian social conditions in respect to the purity of marriage relations.

Finally, there is the economic question treated in the text.

youths. Thus there is no automatic "preventive" check on the growth of numbers; nothing but the "positive" check of famine, and the deaths that follow when disease comes amongst an underfed population.

§ 6. Nor is there ever, as in Western countries, a reasonable fluidity of labour force between industry and industry, and between grade and grade. In a society like our own the children flow naturally into the rising trades, seeing that these offer more and better-paid openings than the stationary trades; they avoid the falling trades, where, even if they wished it, they would find it comparatively difficult to find employment. The spontaneous influx and efflux calls for little prevision. It is not any special far-sightedness on the part of parents and paymasters that brings it about. For the adult labour that is already stiffened into a single industrial occupation for the products of which the market demand is diminishing, there is suffering, of course. But it is seldom such suffering as came to the medieval village when harvests fell short. It is never such suffering as comes in India when the monsoon fails.[1]

[1] There is a similar lack of mobility between district and district. "The people of India have a great dislike to leaving their homes. The census shows that nine-tenths of the population are resident in the districts in which they were born, and of the remaining one-tenth the great majority are settled within easy reach of their native districts" (*Memorandum on Indian Administration*, 1909. [Cd. 4956]).

This has been in the past the most outstanding effect, on its social side, of the Caste system. (In its religious aspects, especially in its preventing the growth of the feeling of human brotherhood outside certain lines, Caste may have evils of a deeper character. These are discussed later.) In all countries subjected to the ebb and flow of modern trade, what is especially desired is such mobility of labour and capital that the appropriate number of appropriate people may be attracted into each several branch of commerce and industry, the right man thus having a reasonable opportunity of finding his way into the right place. Only as we approach this ideal in the Western world shall we escape the more serious dislocations and consequent suffering due to business failures (apart from those consequent on unbridled greed and reckless gambling), the alternations of booms and depressions, the widespread unemployment that results from the industrial maladjustments which we label Overproduction and Underconsumption, the wastefulness of training dull members of the middle classes for professional careers to which they are unsuited, and of leaving unutilized the talents of exceptional children who happen to have working-class parents. This, of course, is the underlying aim of such paternalistic and "socialistic" institutions as the scholarship ladder or our labour

bureaux, the value of which would be utterly negatived by restrictions such as those of Caste. The ubiquity of Caste regulations and their obstructive nature must be remembered whenever the most seemingly simple of the proposals put forward for remedying the social evils of India is under discussion. Owing to the Caste system no reform scheme in India can ever be simple—simple to carry out, or simple in its effects.

But we may note that in this, its economic aspect—the principle by which each individual is restricted to an hereditary group of occupations—Caste would seem to be distinctly losing its grip. Even Brahmins may now be found gaining their livelihood by farming or by retail trade. This aspect, therefore, of the Caste evil is likely in the future to be of diminishing importance, and thus the excessive suffering that is caused by immobility of labour may be expected to die down till it approximates to the level to which we are accustomed in Western lands.

§ 7. Other causes that not only hold back the people as a people from advancing economically, but also cripple countless numbers individually, are the Indian's childish follies in expenditure and in reckless borrowing, and the absence of openings for the investment of small savings. Thrifty in his habits from day to day, the Indian flings away light-heartedly a year's income on the

celebration of his child's wedding. It is the custom; and he has not the courage to break it. Usually he plunges into debt in order to carry through the ceremony in satisfactory style, and probably never gets free again for the rest of his life.[1] Moreover, if he be of a saving disposition, almost his only substitute for the banking system and the joint-stock company of the West—our great conduits for pouring into industry and commerce all the petty surpluses of the middle and lower classes—is the purchase of jewellery;[2]—hoarded wealth which certainly does not easily deteriorate in quality (though in market value silver has been steadily going downhill for the last quarter-century and more), but which plays

[1] Cf. Dr. J. P. Jones, "British Rule in India," *North American Review*, March 1899. "It does not help, but rather aggravates, the situation to be told that most of this evil which the people bear is self-imposed. They reveal a combination of blind improvidence, reckless expenditure, and an unwillingness to shake off mpoverishing customs. For instance, the debt incurring propensity of the native is akin to insanity. Hardly a member of the community is free from debt. In fact, it is believed by the ordinary man here that a debt incurred is a true badge of respectability. All the poor people with whom the writer is acquainted are tied hand and foot to this terrible millstone. And the interest paid is crushing."

[2] This is becoming somewhat less true, however. There are now 8000 savings banks with about 1,200,000 depositors, of whom over a million are Indians, the total deposits being about £10,000,000. Still, it is worth noting that India's net absorption of gold and silver from outside has amounted in the last half-century to an average of £8,400,000 a year. (See the *Memorandum on Indian Administration*, 1909. [Cd. 4956].)

no further part in furthering the production of future wealth.[1]

No wonder an Indian statesman[2] finds it in him to say that "the longer one lives, observes, and thinks, the more deeply does he feel there is no community on the face of the earth which suffers less from political evils and more from self-inflicted, or self-accepted, or self-created, and therefore avoidable evils, than the Hindu community."

§ 8. The Indian social system makes no provision for change.[3] "Progress" is an idea which, prior to the recent influx of Western ideas, has filled no place in the Hindu's intellectual furnishing. Progress, indeed, has been left out of his cosmology; except the progress of the soul towards the silent haven where progress and change are known no more.

Indian social history (as far as we can guess at its character from princely records of ruthless warfare), and the social future of India (as far as

[1] The display of all this useless metal is no doubt the chief cause of the early travellers' conception that India was rich beyond the dreams of avarice. Western capital shows itself in the dingier form of factories and railroads. Incidentally, too, it is worth remarking that the jewellery, worn as it regularly is by women and children, is the cause of endless crimes of violence.

[2] Raja Sir T. Madhava Rao, K.C.S.I., quoted by Dr. Jones, *ibid.*, p. 242.

[3] "To Hinduism Progress is unthinkable, and Change is the essence of all heresies" (Mr. J. N. Farquhar, *Contemporary Review*, May 1908).

the superficial observer can infer from what he sees about him), take on a sombreness of colour that is due to the presence of a stagnation in material conditions that can hardly do other than beget a sense of disheartening helplessness. There is no room for wonder, therefore, if the Indian's religion is a religion of pessimism. A social environment of distress and hopelessness has reacted on the meditations of religious thinkers; and the resultant pessimism of priests and poets has prevented the fogs of helplessness and hopelessness from rising. What has been will be. Sufficient unto the day is the misery thereof. . . . And so, generation after generation, the weary round repeats itself; and the Hindu treads for ever a vicious circle, from which escape seems well-nigh impossible.

Progress of some sort there has of course been in the last century, even as regards the common folk's standard of living. Witness the frequent Anglo-Indian expressions of annoyance at the rising level of servants' wages. Witness also the persistent, though possibly biassed, optimism of the commercial classes. The Parsi Chairman of the Bombay Stock Exchange, for instance, in his annual address (1907), stated that "it was the conviction of merchants, bankers, tradesmen, and captains of industry that India is slowly but steadily advancing along paths of material pros-

perity, and for the last few years it has taken an accelerated pace."[1] "Sir John Hewett, the able Lieutenant-Governor of the United Provinces, draws a very interesting comparison between the drought of 1907 and that of 1900. In their intensity there was little difference between them, but there was a great difference in the bearing of the people. The 1900 famine was a labourers' famine. They crowded on to the relief works from the first; but at the last famine the labouring population did not resort in large numbers to relief works, except in the very severely affected districts. Sir John draws the deduction that the position of the labouring classes has improved during the last decade. He also states that wages have risen in the provinces in much greater proportion than the price of food, and he concludes with these words: 'That labour has become dearer and more independent every year, and to a large extent the cultivating classes no longer depend solely on cultivation.'"[2]

"So far as ordinary tests can be applied, the average Indian landholder, trader, ryot, or handicraftsman is better off than he was fifty years ago.

[1] Quoted by Dr. J. P. Jones, *India: Its Life and Thought*, 1908, p. 14.

[2] From the Indian Budget Speech of the Master of Elibank in the House of Commons, 5 August, 1909.

He consumes more salt, more sugar, more tobacco, and far more imported luxuries and conveniences than he did a generation back. Where house-to-house inquiries have been made, it has been found that the average villager eats more food and has a better house than his father; that to a considerable extent brass or other metal vessels have taken the place of the coarse earthenware vessels of earlier times; and that his family possess more clothes than formerly."[1]

But such material progress in itself is slight and slow; while the desires of the articulate classes, their views as to proper conditions of livelihood, and their consequent discontent, are developing comparatively fast.

The progress to the untrained observer is non-existent, and may even in the circumstances naturally seem, as it seems to many educated natives, to be, not progress, but retrogression.[2] And so it is that pessimism remains, and seems likely to remain, the dominant thread still, in the warp and woof of Indian thought.

§ 9. How are our teachers to deal with a population imbued with such ideas as these? And if, as is the case, the substantial frame-

[1] Memorandum on Some of the Results of Indian Administration during the past fifty years, 1909 [Cd. 4956], price 3½d. For modifications and qualifications of these statements the whole of this little Memorandum should be read.

[2] See quotations, p. 154, *infra*.

work of every man's thought contains elements incompatible with a belief in progress, how can we stimulate towards progress without assailing the demoralizing beliefs themselves? Optimism is a *sine qua non* of the higher moral life, the life of growth; and in a land like India especially, the most sympathetic earnestness can achieve little if deprived of the support of confident hope alike in teacher and in taught.

Somehow an atmosphere of optimism must be created; and if Indian religious philosophies are irremediably tainted with the poison of despair, then (even from the agnostic standpoint) the sooner the Indian creeds loose their benumbing hold on the national energies, the better for India and for the world.

§ 10. The problems with regard to religious education which confront us in India are very different from those by which we are faced in white countries or when we are dealing with the native population of, say, South Africa. In India we deal with an essentially religious population. What we have to ask ourselves is whether our ethical system has such inherent strength that it can impress itself, without religious sanction, on minds already filled with alien religious conceptions—conceptions which may at times actively conflict with our most confident teaching about the nobility of certain kinds of conduct. In a country

like South Africa there are current among the masses no rival systems of ethico-religious thought whose influence has seriously to be combated before we can make a beginning with the higher teaching of Christianity. In India[1] the daily thought even of the lowliest of the common folk seems to be coloured by a pantheistic metaphysic which baffles us at every turn by its insistence on the indifference of the universe towards what we call "sin."

§ 11. Let us pause for a moment to elucidate this point, and observe the destructive effect of pantheistic doctrine in the region of morals.

If All is God and God is All, there can be no distinction of good and evil in the universe; there can be none of that preferential attitude

[1] The following discussion of current religious and moral beliefs is intended to apply only to the Hindu communities, which, however, comprise about four-fifths of the population. Mohammedanism in India seems to have lost a little (though not much) of its hard clear outlines, through contact with Hinduism. (It has even, in spite of its natural democratic spirit of equality between all believers, yielded to some extent to the influence of the Caste system.) But ethically and philosophically it remains the religion of the "closed book," a religion that seems incapable of developing, save in unimportant directions, without ceasing to be itself. How far it may, under the expanding influence of modern thought, change its rigid character and acquire a new fluidity such as Christianity has in the last half-century put on, is a problem for the future. There are, however, hopeful signs to be noted. (See, e.g., in the *Nineteenth Century*, Oct. 1908, "Can Islam be reformed?", by Sir T. Morison.)

which Christians tend to associate with belief in a personal God. There can be nothing closely analogous to Will in such a world; or if there is, it will be a completely non-moral Will. "For if there is but One Will in the universe the very conception of sin is cut away, and all that man is and does is but the outcome, here and in time, of that One All-pervading Will which knows no time and no space; then man's worst deeds and his best are not his in any such sense as shall leave sin really sin. They are not only willed by God, so far as there is a God; they are the acts of God Himself, or at least of that Totality of Being in which both God and man are but unreally, impersonally immanent. Then God and man, holiness and unholiness, sin and goodness all merge in the impersonal One-and-All, which cannot be moral or immoral, which is simply and inevitably non-moral."[1]

"For the Hindu philosopher—and every educated Hindu is nominally a follower of some philosophic school—God is a purely intellectual concept. Unknowable in Himself, He is at once the cause and the effect, the creator and the world-all. He is the absolute, the nothingness where being and not-being meet, pure thought without an object, pure joy without desire, a God who neither loves nor hates, free from all anthropomorphic

[1] Bishop Mylne, *Missions to Hindus*, 1908, p. 24.

stain. To realize oneself as the cosmic Ego is the end of man."[1]

Individuality thus becomes unreal—a sham, such as many Western thinkers conceive freedom of the will to be. And the feeling of illusion comes to pervade the whole of life, on its intellectual and its practical sides alike.

"Thus a subtle sense of unreality, of the nothingness of life and its content, pervades, like a kind of miasma, the thought of the Hindu community. . . .

"It may be only those who have leisure, who have meditated on the problem for themselves, to whom these thoughts are conscious realities. But their paralysing effects upon effort extend through society as a whole. Tell a man—let him know without telling, through the impalpable, pervading effects which thinkers produce on non-thinkers—that his life is but a bubble, a ripple on the surface of the Eternal Stream; and the inevitable conclusion must be this—that the stream will flow on just the same whether the ripple on its surface, which is oneself, have laughingly flashed in the sun with a joyous swirl of free effort, or have sullenly murmured itself away in the blackness of accidie and sloth. The unconscious, non-moral Totality, which is all that is left of a God under

[1] Mr. J. Kennedy, I.C.S., "The Tendencies of Modern Hinduism," *The East and the West* (London), April 1905.

the sway of the Pantheistic conception, has realized itself into consciousness, all the same, whether you, its poor manifestation, have expressed it in this way or in that, as the two Eternities met in the moment of your seeming existence."[1]

§ 12. "It is hopeless to argue, for instance, with a man who refuses to admit any moral distinction of acts, and declares the words 'good' and 'bad' to be meaningless terms." So writes another missionary.[2] Arguing about ethical questions, while certain underlying religious conceptions remain unshaken, will always be a beating of the air in India. The Indian loves argument; and he sees no logical connection between accepting a chain of ethical reasoning and putting the ethical conclusions into practice.[3] To the impatient Western moralist the Indian seems therefore hopelessly illogical. The Indian smilingly ignores the charge, or hears it with

[1] Bishop Mylne, *Missions to Hindus*, 1908, pp. 54–7.

[2] Rev. E. S. Oakley, in *The East and the West*, January 1907.

[3] "The worse type of Indian is ready to accept Christianity for the material benefit it brings him, the better is ready to discuss it from an intellectual standpoint, but neither goes further and welcomes it as a solution of the problem of life" (Mr. G. F. Deas, in *The Hibbert Journal*, July 1903). Mr. Deas goes on to quote the Rev. G. Longridge's *History of the Oxford Mission to Calcutta*: "The Bengali is always ready to talk about religion—nothing is easier than to get him on to a religious subject; but then one discovers, to one's great disappointment, that his interest in it is merely intellectual and superficial, and that nothing is further from his thoughts than to accept any responsibility for such truth as he is led to acknowledge."

enjoyment. To him it is only a proof of the shallowness of his opponent's philosophy. Both parties have before them a series of fundamental assumptions, so obvious, so unquestionable, that it is not worth while to render them explicit. But the two series of seemingly unquestionable assumptions are diametrically opposed, and neither combatant in the philosophical arena has come within reach of the other.

To the English mind ethical systems (at any rate since the English mind shook off the obsession of monastic ideals) are primarily concerned with social relations, and all religion is in the main ethical. It is doubtful whether the Indian would admit either proposition.[1] Religion to him is not ethical; and if there is any such thing as ethics its main concern is not with beneficent activity or self-sacrifice for the good of others, but with the means of attaining self-suppression for its own sake.[2]

[1] See, however, the footnote to p. 4, *supra*.

[2] As showing the contrasted attitudes of one Oriental nation and another we may take the following from Wuttke (quoted in Dr. W. I. Chamberlain's *Education in India*, 1899, p. 14): "The Chinese educate for practical life, the Indians for the ideal; those for earth, these for heaven; those educate their sons for entering the world, these for going out of it; those educate for citizenship, these for priesthood; those for industrial activity, these for knowledge; those teach their sons the laws of the state, these teach them the essence of the Godhead; those lead their sons into the world, these lead them out of the world into themselves; those teach their children to earn and enjoy, these to beg and to renunciate."

The aim of Hindu ethics is primarily negative—the attainment of self-suppression as an end in itself; though asceticism may also be practised for the sake of a quasi-magical power over gods and men. "When the Hindu ascetic has not this object in self-renunciation, his austerities are an end in themselves. He renounces all—not simply the mean things of life, but also the noblest ambitions and the most heavenly sentiments—because they are a fetter which bind him to the world. He indeed calls a good deed, or a holy thought, a 'golden fetter,' but it is, just the same, regarded by him as an evil which prolongs his human existence; and these human conditions must be ended as soon as possible. The Christian, on the other hand, suppresses his passions in order that his holy desires may prevail; the Hindu struggles equally against the worst passions and the noblest sentiments of his heart; for they all delay that calm equilibrium of the *self* which is the doorway into *sâyutchia* (absorption)."[1]

[1] Dr. J. P. Jones, *India: Its Life and Thought*, 1908, p. 229. Compare also the following: "Of religious service as a divine philanthropy, that enthusiasm for humanity which consecrates a life to the service of one's fellows, the Hindu has no experience. All this is on the inferior plane of action, whereas his thought is fixed on the superior plane of inaction. He may respect the philanthropist, but he will reverence the fakir. The speech of the teacher is silvern, but the silence of the recluse is golden; the good deeds of the philanthropist are meritorious, but the absolute passivity and inactivity of the hermit are the true marks of the divine. These ideas are not confined to the higher classes or to

This ascetic ideal is, as has been pointed out already, the offshoot of India's pantheistic metaphysic, a religious philosophy which regards personality as nothing more than a diseased illusion, an earthy vileness to be shuffled off as soon as may be. And as long as the metaphysical bias remains—and doubtless its strength will be greatest among those who least clearly comprehend the philosophic system within which they move entangled[1]—there is little possibility of Western ideals (whether advocated as "Christian" or not

those more deeply versed in the Hinduism of the books, they are equally shared in by the lowly and illiterate" (Rev. Bernard Lucas, *The Empire of Christ*, 1907, p. 61). (The student of comparative ethics will not fail to observe the close analogy and the sharp antithesis presented to Hindu thought by Roman Stoicism. The strenuous Stoic, who gloried in a life filled with vigorous action, was intensely conscious of his separate individuality, holding that only he himself by his own actions could harm the particle of divine life which constituted his soul—a soul, however, which he did not hold to be immortal. But while he glorified activity and personality — which the Hindu is convinced are evil and illusory —the Stoic, equally with the Hindu, believed all emotions, the passionate personal love that we consider ennobling, as well as envy, malice, anger, and lust, to be failings which the good man will strive at all costs to trample underfoot.)

[1] "In the West, idealism is a hot-house plant; in India, it is a common wayside shrub. The Western is, as a rule, an idealist with difficulty; the Hindu is with difficulty anything else" (Rev. Bernard Lucas, *The Empire of Christ*, 1907, p. 54). "The thousands of Hindus know comparatively nothing of Pantheism as a system, but a more or less pantheistic view of the universe is ingrained in their mental constitution. Talk with the rudest villager engaged in offering his cocoanut or flowers to the crudest idol, and you will soon discover that beneath his idolatry there is a Pantheism from which he never gets away" (*ibid.*, p. 49).

matters little) influencing appreciably the life of the multitude.

§ 13. Far-away readers of academic treatises and romantic presentations of Buddhist[1] and Hindu[2] morality are inclined to imagine that a religious philosophy which inculcates the insubstantiality of this present world must make for a self-sacrificing indifference to the things of the world. Yet it does not seem actually to be so. The same metaphysical bias that weakens the belief in the reality of the external material world would seem also to weaken the belief in the binding force, the fixity, the sanctity, of the external ties of duty—save only (and most strangely) the external ties of that cramping code of petty regulations that forms the essence of Caste. A certain concreteness of mental outlook is requisite for the practical acceptance of Western ethical ideals; and this concreteness, this logicality (as it seems to us) is sadly lacking in the East.[3] The ideal-

[1] e.g. Mr. H. Fielding Hall's *The Inward Light.*

[2] e.g. Sister Nivedita's *The Web of Indian Life*, and the writings of Mrs. Besant.

[3] This is much less true of the Mohammedan fifth of the population than of the Hindu majority. It is not true at all of the tiny Parsi community, whose religious philosophy and practical outlook on life are very much what ours are. (The Parsis in India number less than 100,000.) Yet, with all allowance for exceptions such as these, the dictum of "a shrewd observer" (quoted by Mr. H. P. Mody, *The Political Future of India*, 1908, p. 45) holds substantially good: "To take only one point, it will be found that the ideal of sanctity is the same throughout India; so that there are saints who are held in veneration by men of all religions in India."

istic philosopher in England often feels that the one thing most needed is the evocation of a deeper sense of the reality of the non-material. In India he comes instead to feel that it is the reality, the causal interconnectedness of external things, that need to be grasped more vividly in order that the foundations of an orderly life, self-respecting and other-respecting, may be firmly laid.

§ 14. Yet, in relation to certain of the higher aspects of life, it must be admitted that the Indian has grasped the principle of causality more firmly and introduced it more fully into his theological systems than the Westerner has ever done; for the law of transmigration, the doctrine of *Karma*, may be reasonably interpreted as little else than the transferring to the spiritual world of the natural law of the conservation of energy.[1]

According to this doctrine the transmigrating soul carries forward mechanically from life to life the consequences of its previous good and evil deeds. But the good and evil on which the doctrine lays stress are very different indeed from the good and evil of Christian morality. According to Hindu teaching, one aims throughout life, if one is wise, at the suppression of every self-regarding,

[1] This is well brought out in Paul Dahlke's *Buddhist Essays* (English translation by Bhikkhu Silacara, 1908), in the case of the allied form of the doctrine which appears in Buddhist philosophy.

self-sustaining impulse; and that not primarily in the interest of others; not altruistically. It is not that losing of oneself to find oneself in the service of one's fellows that is inculcated by the higher Christianity. Rather the Eastern sage would urge on his disciples to do good works in order that they may lose themselves, and in perfected nothingness—merged at last in the ocean of pure undifferentiated being—attain the highest of all conceivable blessings.[1] By much asceticism, by patient pondering on the mysteries of the universe, by fasting and silence, he may approach a little nearer to the goal of supreme felicity—the felicity of doing nothing, suffering nothing, knowing nothing, desiring nothing. But the journey is long, and the task so hard, that even the most earnest of striving souls can scarcely hope to attain to this perfec-

[1] "Now our whole English civilization, our whole idea of the reality of the world and the rationality of the universe, our whole conception of progress, is rooted in the thought that personality, the efforts of individuality, the desire and the will to live, is a good and not a bad thing. Hindu civilization is rooted on an exactly contrary idea—the conception that the world and all its visible phenomena and all human life is one great illusion which has to be got rid of at all cost, and behind which there is the one impersonal reality" (the Bishop of Birmingham, in *The East and the West*, January 1905). "The practical ideal of the Christian is to use every faculty that he possesses for the glory of God and the welfare of his fellow-men. The ideal of the orthodox Hindu is to get rid of every faculty he possesses by withdrawing from the work of the world and losing himself in the Infinite" (the Bishop of Madras, in the same number).

tion of indifference within the span of a single life.[1]

§ 15. But the demoralizing influences (as they cannot but seem to Western minds) of a non-moral pantheism (and, the missionary would add, of the *Karma* doctrine) do not stand alone. They are reinforced by the all-pervading system of Caste, whereby the responsibility of thinking out questions of right and wrong is taken from the shoulders of the individual and laid upon the group of which he is a lifelong member. "[Hindu

[1] Missionaries insist with something like unanimity that the doctrine is in practical life demoralizing. "The fact" (writes the Rev. J. H. Maclean, *The East and the West*, April 1907) "that the sufferer has no knowledge of the sin for which he suffers, together with the fact that the hope of ultimate release is so remote as to prove almost inoperative, deprives the doctrine of much of the power which it ought to possess. The ordinary Hindu uses the doctrine not as a deterrent, but rather as a means of explaining his present ill luck." "We do not, as a rule" (he continues), "find people arguing that since the soul is the only reality the joys and sorrows of the world are of little account, but rather that since God is the only reality He must be the cause of all things, *sin included*. Just as the ordinary Hindu uses the doctrine of *karma* to throw the blame of his condition on some previous existence, so he uses the doctrine that God is all to throw the responsibility on Him. Along both these lines he persuades himself that the fault is not his own."

Such inferences, however, as to the psychological effects of theological dogmas on temperaments so alien from our own as the Indian, are to be received with extreme caution. For a sympathetic attempt on the part of a shrewd and widely-experienced observer to estimate the practical moral effects both of the *Karma* doctrine and of the pantheistic metaphysic of the Hindu, the reader may be referred to Sir A. Lyall's *Asiatic Studies*, Second Series, chap. I.

life] in its moral and social aspects, under which it is known to us as Caste, owns a detailed system of obligations; all of them purely positive, with no grand moral principle to polarize this amorphous conglomeration; without even a line of demarcation between moral and ceremonial precepts; with no higher binding obligation than that of traditional rules, which vary indefinitely in detail; and with no universal application outside of particular groups. As the group, with its ancestral qualifications, forms alike the unit of society and its ultimate constituent element, there is no room under the system of Caste for individual liberty on the one hand, or for universal obligations on the other. . . *Thou shalt obey the rules of thy caste* forms a summary of Hindu morality—complete, without exception, without pity, without scope for any larger outlook, without allowance for any modifying circumstance; law without equity, without principle; law for law's sake; law to which obedience is everything, since the spirit, as distinguished from the letter, is neither acknowledged in fact nor regarded as possible in the abstract."[1] The writer supplies various instances exemplifying this attitude towards life, of which it will be sufficient to quote one: "It came within my knowledge that a Brahmin was impeached before his caste by an

[1] Bishop Mylne, *Missions to Hindus*, 1908, p. 40.

injured Mahommedan husband, the sanctity of whose home he had invaded. He was condemned and excommunicated from his caste. But for what? Not for having sinned against God; not for having injured the Mahommedan, towards whom it was not to be assumed that a Hindu owed any obligation; but on the ground of ceremonial defilement—that the unhappy sharer of his sin was not a Hindu by birth." [1]

§ 16. And Caste is not a mere incident of the Hindu religion. It is of its very essence—a stronger, more potent influence in the lives of its adherents than all other forces together. It is the main conserving agent which has enabled the religious system after each passing wave of religious reform (such as the great Buddhist movement of early centuries) to reconstitute itself and absorb into itself the forces which threatened its destruction. "One has well said that Hinduism and caste are convertible terms." [2] "This connection between caste and religion must always be borne in mind in regarding it. As long as a Hindu remains a Hindu in thought and feeling, so long must he regard caste, not as a social institution, but as a natural and religious constitution which it is irrational to question and impious to attempt to alter. To speak of the

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 61.

[2] Dr. J. P. Jones, *India: Its Life and Thought*, 1908, p. 199.

accident of birth is to his mind to betray utter ignorance, for birth is of all things that which is no accident. It is the manifestation of the unswerving and unerring law of Karma. . . Brahmin and Pariah are such by virtue not of what they do or even are now, but by virtue of that which through an age-long process they have become. They may change places in the future, but for the life that now is they are separated by an impassable barrier."[1]

§ 17. These paragraphs, however, must not be taken as implying that the Caste system, when considered in conjunction with all the other aspects of life in India, is unquestionably evil in *all* its workings. The evil sides of it are those which are most conspicuous (like the evils in the ceremonialism and caste pride of the Pharisees of New Testament times). But, as I have suggested elsewhere,[2] "One of the chief points to which trained observation needs to be steadily directed in the case of these Asiatic civilizations, would seem to be the comparative ethical value of the communal system as a means not only of conserving, but of advancing personal morality. Both in India and China caste regulations or the claims of the family seem to take the place of a broadly based system of morals. To what extent such

[1] Rev. Bernard Lucas, *The Empire of Christ*, 1907, p. 67.
[2] *The White Man's Work in Asia and Africa*, 1907, pp. 9–10.

traditional restraints on the individual are hindrances to further development, and to what extent they may be claimed as indispensable buttresses of the existing civilization, are subjects for philosophic scrutiny, requiring a patient gathering of evidence which has never yet been seriously attempted."

Nor, even though all observers were unanimous in declaring the Caste system to be preponderantly evil in its working, should we be justified in treating it as an isolated evil phenomenon, and making a precipitate frontal attack upon its existence regardless of side issues and incidental consequences. For there are grave differences between a religious institution which is also a social institution, and a religious belief which in itself is an unmitigated evil—such as those others we have just discussed. Evil beliefs may be assailed with little hesitation: evil institutions are seldom wholly evil, and must be treated, therefore, with more circumspection. A premature assault on these strongholds of evil is likely, indeed, to result in little more than the disabling of Christianity for the attainment of other aims. Destruction, even of the worst institutions, is nearly always accompanied by incidental evils, and these it should be our aim to minimize. For continuity, equally with the introduction and propagation of new ideals, is essential to national

development. There is need of a firm holding on to the good of the past, as well as a bold breaking away towards the good of the future. "Their civilization, though different from ours, has a consistency as a whole; and we cannot easily eliminate certain parts and substitute for them those of our own civilization without dislocating the whole. Therefore it is often safer and better to conserve what seems to us the lesser good of their civilization than to introduce what seems the greater good of our own." [1]

But the ethical importance of the Caste system in the Indian's scheme of life must be clearly grasped before the effects likely to follow on the introduction of Western education and Western religious and political ideals can be understood.

And furthermore, not only is Caste a cause of social evils of a material kind owing to the obstacles it imposes on the fluidity of labour, and a cause of spiritual evil in preventing the growth of a consciousness of universal human brotherhood or a sense of the underlying reasonableness of altruistic ethics; it is also a potent cause of intellectual stagnation, co-operating as it does with the self-sufficing nature of the village communities in presenting barriers to the spread of new ideas. The importance of this last aspect of it was seemingly overlooked

[1] Dr. J. P. Jones, *India's Problem: Krishna or Christ?*, 1903, p. 25.

by the early educationists, who hoped that the illumination which Western education might bring to the better classes would spread from stratum to stratum till all alike should know the blessings of enlightenment. But this hope is passing with the growth of experience. To put it in its extreme form, "the notion once held that instruction would reach the masses best by 'downward filtration' from the literate minority, was based on a misconception of the character of Brahmanic society, and has long since been abandoned."[1]

The older view, however, has still its advocates, and continues to hold its own (as one would expect) on Congress platforms. And there is this to be said in its favour, that most observers declare that the "unrest" of the educated classes, their emotional dissatisfaction with the general situation, has already widely affected the ignorant classes.

§ 18. As an evil closely allied with the system of Caste should be mentioned also the position of women. Their social status and their life careers are largely determined by Caste law, which regulates with especial care everything to do with marriage. Caste throws obstacles in the way of women's advancement

[1] Mr. J. A. Baines, C.S.I. "Popular Education in India," *Journal of the Statistical Society*, June 1894.

and intellectual emancipation; while their ignorance and invincible conservatism constitute perhaps the most serious hindrance to all efforts towards the modification of Caste tyranny. Thus we have a vicious circle, from which escape is not easy. As Lord Curzon's resolution of the 11th March, 1904, puts it: "In their efforts to promote female education, the Government have always encountered peculiar difficulties arising from the social customs[1] of the people, but they have acted on the view that through female education a far greater proportional impulse is imparted to the educational and moral tone of the people than by the education of men."

This, however, is a large subject, and opens up many difficult problems. It is impossible here to do more than give it such passing mention as will suffice to call the reader's attention to its existence.

§ 19. Finally, before passing on to other topics, it is necessary to emphasize here the commonplace concerning popular Hinduism that it is not one simple creed or system, but an amorphous mass of miscellaneous religious elements—combined in inextricable confusion. Caste is perhaps its most characteristic feature; and into the fantastic network of its ceremonial restric-

[1] The spread of education among Mohammedan females, it need hardly be added, is hindered by social obstacles as serious as those of Caste.

tions have been drawn tribes and communities from the most diverse intellectual levels and of the most divergent social status and from every conceivable grade of barbarism and civilization. Side by side in India dwell representatives of the most primeval savagery and of the most deeply philosophic culture.[1] And so, though these two—the quietism of an ethical system that seeks beatitude in self-repression, and the ceremonial law of caste—may seem to the cultured observer the mainsprings of the people's moral and spiritual life, it must not be forgotten that all manner of debased and debasing forms of polytheism, demonolatry and fetish-worship have been absorbed into the Hinduism of different provinces, and that in many districts these sub-currents of religious idiosyncrasy are more potent, especially when the superstitious mob grows excited, than the better seen, better understood surface currents which have been described in the foregoing sections as typical of the religious temper of the land. Even the advanced representatives of modern culture seem in many cases to be, in practice, still under the yoke of the most

[1] A story related by Lord Curzon is cited by the Rev. N. Macnicol (*Hibbert Journal*, October 1907) as "an admirable parable of this characteristic of Hinduism." Lord Curzon tells how a friend examined the arrows in the quiver of a native hunter. "He found that the first was tipped with stone of the neolithic age, and the next was tipped with electric telegraph wire—a theft from the twentieth century."

retrograde superstitions ;[1] and this renders the future of India subject to incalculable forces, and makes all vaticination perilous in the extreme, if not utterly futile. "That the old religious power" (writes the Rev. N. Macnicol[2]) "is lying latent all the time one cannot doubt, and to govern India in oblivion of those slumbering fires is to commit a capital mistake. There are indications that they are awaking again to activity, and that the future of India will be largely determined by the fuel that those passions find. Already there is evidence that the combination of Indian religious intensity with Western science and Western politics is producing in some cases a chemical product as explosive and as dangerous as picric acid."

§ 20. But if the outstanding social institutions of India and the more striking features in Indian philosophy are such as to hinder material progress

[1] "Lastly, superstition has certainly not declined, even among the educated . . . The present writer knew of a Hindu lecturer on chemistry, who, becoming blind, used a miraculous handkerchief as the best means of recovering his sight" (Mr. J. Kennedy, I.C.S., *The East and the West*, London, October 1904). I have seen in the police news of an Indian paper a case in which a master in a leading Government high school sued some charlatans for recovery of sums he had advanced for the proper performance of certain incantations, the purpose of which was to locate the precise spot where astrological calculations had declared that hidden treasure lay buried in the Victoria Gardens, Bombay.

[2] "Spiritual Forces in India," *Contemporary Review*, September 1909.

and moral development, the question naturally arises—Can we point to any indigenous institutions in India which *have* tended to foster what we should consider a "sense of duty"?

Of religious institutions there have probably been very few, though Mohammedanism and Zoroastrianism have inculcated duties which we are able to recognize as such. Buddhism spent its force[1] centuries before the English conquest. Unreformed Hinduism is not an ethical religion; and though caste rules have had a certain elementary disciplinary effect, they emphasize (as has already been pointed out) not moral but ceremonial duties. It is not for social crimes

[1] Buddhism bears much the same relation to Hinduism that Christianity bears to Judaism. It seems to have begun in a large measure as a reaction against the cruel and unspiritually oppressive restrictions of the ceremonial "law" of Caste. It emphasized the universality of the brotherhood of man, and went forth as a reforming missionary religion. In its own home, however, it was eventually swamped by a resurgence of Hinduism, and is now confined to the outskirts and fringes of India—Thibet, Burmah, Ceylon. One special legacy for good it seems to have left behind it in the Indian's extreme tenderness as regards animal suffering. Indian papers will quote descriptions of English "blood sports" (such as hunting) with an obviously natural and genuine horror, such as an Englishman would be expected to feel towards gladiatorial combats or the tortures inflicted on their captives by Sioux and Iroquois. Hospitals for animals abound. The truly religious mendicant shrinks from killing the lice that infest his blankets. The shooting of a superannuated horse by departmental authority (see Sir F. S. P. Lely's *Suggestions for the Better Governing of India*, pp. 18–19) is talked over with horror by the Jains, much as we should talk of the shooting of a war-worn soldier whom the Government could not afford to pension.

such as adultery that a Hindu loses caste, but for marrying or eating with those of a "lower" stratum. Hinduism does indeed honour the ascetic, but blind asceticism surely militates against, not for, what we account highest in ethics.

The reformed phases of Hinduism connected with the names of the Arya Samaj and the Brahma Samaj have, it would seem, a strongly ethical character,[1] though English missionaries have been found to abuse them as political societies in disguise—as if ethics and politics in such a country as the India of to-day were easily separable, or their separation desirable. But these great ethical societies, it is hardly too much to say, are the direct offspring of Western ethical influences.[2] They are the outward shapes that Christianity

[1] Of the Brahmoists Mr. Kennedy writes (*The East and the West*, April 1905): "Liberation is no longer to be attained by merging the human soul in the infinite, for that is impossible, and immortality is at once the lot and the solace of mankind. . . . The passive virtues are not the greatest, and the Antinomian quietism which regarded virtue and vice as equally indifferent is now anathematized. Thus the old scheme of salvation melts away, and the dawn begins of a new ethos, a sense of personality, and a desire for individual immortality. Indeed, the Brahmoist position is not unlike Spinoza's."

[2] "[The Christian] conceptions of religion as bearing fruit in conduct, and of the ideal character, which religion aims at producing, as directed towards the service of others, are foreign to the old Indian faiths. Accordingly, what we see happening in India is not merely the remoulding of religious ideals in view of a higher standard of morality; it is, on the one hand, the conjunc-

has taken when adopted by Indian thinkers who, though attracted by Christian ethics, cannot accept the doctrines of English Christianity in their entirety, and to whom also, it may perhaps be added, Christianity, as the religion of the foreigner, is repugnant.

The organization of the village communities has co-operated with caste requirements to restrain and control lawless egoism. But it is doubtful whether the village organization has contributed to any extent in fostering a healthy altruism. Under the eye of the village elders and in view of the terrible weapons of excommunication and practical outlawry wielded by the caste, we admit that it is not to be expected that the peasant should grow up to be a social pest. But, on the other hand, persistent repression of vicious tendencies by the force of an unescapable public surveillance is clearly no method of begetting a genuine sense of public duty. As Mr. Yusuf Ali says: "There is, therefore, no paradox in the fact that the most beautifully organized structure of the village community led to no advance in civic life—the life that uses the experience and organization of local communities for the formation, development, and support of the wider and more human, as opposed

tion for the first time of morality and religion—the transformation of religion into a sanction for conduct—and, on the other, the interpretation of conduct as loving service" (Rev. N. Macnicol, *The Hibbert Journal*, October 1907).

to a theocratic or other mystic, conception of the State."[1]

We shall not go far wrong then in asserting that, apart from those educational and semi-ecclesiastical institutions which have sprung up, as it were, in response to the stimulus of Western teaching, India has known no public agencies the main object of which has been the furtherance of righteousness (in the Western sense of that word). Natives of India themselves admit this. "It will be at once apparent" (writes one of them[2]) "that our public movements to-day have got this great characteristic about them in which they agree. They are all born of a wider conception of humanity than the movements of the past. They have for their basis an altruism hitherto unknown, or at least unknown in its present form. They are for laying the axe at the root of class and caste

[1] *Life and Labour of the People of India*, 1907, p. 222. It should, however, be noted that it is frequently charged against our bureaucrats that they are responsible for destroying the indigenous system of village self-government and, in consequence, much of the native capacity for initiative in administration. This retrograde influence of our system we are now endeavouring to remedy by the promotion of native activity in municipal affairs. But progress is slow, largely owing to the novelty of modern municipal problems to the native mind, especially when these are complicated by the presence of colonies of Anglo-Indians, whose demands for municipal expenditure on their particular quarters completely outrun the willingness or even the capacity of the native ratepayers to contribute their quota.

[2] Mr. K. Srinivasa Rau, "The Outlook," *East and West* (Bombay), February 1903.

interests, and for liberating the people from the thraldom of ages. . . . Wherefrom is this new spirit? . . . In its origin it is not Indian. It is not Eastern. It is English. . . . That this spirit is exotic to India and to Indian conditions of life and to the framework of Indian society, there can be no question."[1]

[1] Cf. the following quotation from a lecture by a member of the Brahma Samaj: "The spirit of Christianity has already pervaded the whole atmosphere of Indian society, and we breathe, think, feel, and move in a Christian atmosphere. Native society is being roused, enlightened, and reformed under the influence of Christian education. If it is true that the future of a nation is determined by all the circumstances and agencies which to-day influence its nascent growth, surely the future Church of this country will be the result of the purer elements of the leading creeds of the day —harmonized, developed, and shaped under the influence of Christianity" (Keshub Chunder Sen, *The Future Church*, 1869, quoted by Sir H. Bartle Frere, *Indian Missions*, 1874, p. 46).

CHAPTER III

21. OUTSIDE the institutions managed by State and municipal authorities (which between them account for less than 30 per cent of the pupils being educated in British India),[1] secondary and higher education in India — which alone are of importance for our inquiry, elementary education being of so very slight and crude a character—have been normally Hindu or Mohammedan. This is true of the State-aided institutions under private management equally with the private schools. It is true also of the schools in the Native States.

"Two distinct systems of higher education have existed in India side by side throughout the nineteenth century—the indigenous and the Governmental. The indigenous schools[2] whether Mo-

[1] In secondary schools in 1906–7 there were 119,645 pupils in schools under public management and 353,485 in privately managed schools. For primary schools the numbers were 1,361,000 and 2,413,000. The total expenditure by Government and municipalities upon education is less than £4,000,000 per annum.

[2] There are nearly 2000 Sanskrit grammar schools, with 22,000 pupils, mostly in Bengal; and over 2000 Arabic and Persian grammar schools, with 37,000 pupils, in Upper India.

hammedan or Hindu, have always had certain common features: they have always been shy of Government interference; they are mainly theological, and they are unprogressive; they are open to the poorest, their income coming partly from endowments, but more frequently from subscriptions and alms; above all, the teachers and their pupils live in the closest intercourse. Some of these schools have a large number of scholars, they bestow titles for diplomas, and the teachers are often men who have made a considerable pecuniary sacrifice for the love of learning and religion. Here, then, we have the Oriental ideal, in which learning is regarded as the free birthright of every man, and education means the intercourse of the disciple with his master." [1]

This infusion of the religious elements into education has always been of the deepest. As the Bishop of Madras says: [2] "The connection between education and religion meant a good deal more in ancient India than it does in England at the present day. A religious education in England means an education of which religious education forms a part. The education given in an elemen-

[1] Mr. J. Kennedy, I.C.S., *The Asiatic Quarterly*, April 1904. (It should, however, be added in modification of the above that Brahmins hold that the higher education should be religiously restricted to the higher *castes;* cf. also the article by the Rev. J. A. Sharrock, referred to on p. 180 *infra.*)

[2] "Higher Education in India," *The Nineteenth Century*, January 1905.

tary school, for instance, is regarded as a religious education because an hour a day is assigned in the time-table to the teaching of the Bible. But in ancient India religion supplied the whole motive of the higher education of the Brahmans and dominated the whole system. The motive of the teacher was purely a religious one."

"It is only from schools and colleges managed by Government, or by local boards or municipalities, that the dogmatic teaching of religious creeds is excluded. In all other public schools,[1] whether aided or unaided, there is the most complete freedom as regards religious instruction. Not only may the Bible be read, but the other 'Sacred Books of the East' as well. Thus, Protestants of every persuasion, Roman Catholics, Hindus of every sect, Muhammadans, Buddhists, Sikhs, Jains, Parsees, may in these schools each have their own children brought up in their peculiar tenets without let or hindrance from the State. As for private schools, Government interferes with the religious teaching as little as it does with the secular. These schools are carried on by natives for natives, for the most part in the old-fashioned ways; the curriculum, the methods of instruction, the qualifications of the teachers, and the fundamental aim, have all come down from a hoary antiquity, and have been little, if at

[1] i.e. schools which conform to departmental regulations.

all, influenced by modern opinions about education. One of their most characteristic features is the importance attached to knowledge bearing on religion and religious worship."[1]

The English Government, however, has aimed with painstaking anxiety at the maintenance of a strict religious neutrality. "As regards religion, we sit as a Government in India

holding no form of creed
But contemplating all."[2]

§ 22. The educational system is crowned by the work of the five so-called Universities—the degree-granting institutions of Calcutta, Madras, Bombay, Allahabad, and the Punjab. It is to the products of these that we must look if we are to estimate the effects of a predominantly secular Western education on Eastern minds in an Eastern environment. They are not teaching bodies, though they have acquired powers to become such, and have made some slight tentative beginnings in the direction of establishing University chairs for the promotion of special studies. They are primarily examining bodies, to which are affiliated numerous teaching estab-

[1] "Is the Education System of India a Failure?" *The Asiatic Quarterly,* January 1902, by D. Duncan, LL.D., late Director of Public Instruction, Madras.

[2] Lord Curzon's address at the Simla Educational Conference, September 20, 1905.

lishments of very varying grades of efficiency, widely scattered over the country.[1] These teaching institutions are not normally residential, though a few are, and both the missionary bodies and the Government are encouraging the growth of residential hostels, especially in connection with the larger colleges in the cities.[2] The Government does not finance the Universities, nor has it very closely controlled their educational policy. The Universities have till lately been governed by fairly large groups of nominated and elected "Fellows" whose qualifications have not always been educational. By the Act of 1904, however, these governing bodies have been reduced to more manageable proportions by the cutting down of their numbers and the increase of the proportion of expert educationists and officials among them.[3]

[1] The total number of University students is about 18,000, of whom about 5000 are attached to Calcutta University, and another 5000 to Madras.

[2] "The number of students in Arts Colleges who live in hostels or boarding houses is above 4000. This figure . . . represents the point to which the college system in India has at present attained in the progress towards a collegiate residential system. . . . There is no difference of opinion among the Directors as to the benefit derived from the advance of the residential system" (*Quinquennial Review of Education in India*, 1902–1907).

[3] This change, by the way, has met with indignant protests on the part of many who see sinister motives behind this "officializing" of the Universities.

"In the evolution of that educational system, during the régime of that masterful Viceroy, Lord Curzon, that same private enter-

The teaching institutions, being widely scattered, cannot co-operate for efficiency in imparting knowledge, nor can they create a University atmosphere such as we associate with University towns in the West. Education is sought almost exclusively as a means of access to Government employment and to certain professions such as

prise was discouraged, and so we have now the officialized University, and a new Educational system has been brought into effect. . . . Whereas the Government desire to stint education, we desire to promote it by every means in our power" (Mr. Utamlal Trivedi, Congress speech, December 1908). "Not long ago the whole country was convulsed over the report of the Universities Commission, which plainly showed a determination to put an end to high education in this country, and also to abolish the private educational institutions which had gradually grown up around our Universities" (Mr. Lal Mohan Ghose, Presidential Address at the 1903 Congress). The protests raised seem to be distinctly class protests, due largely to natural annoyance on the part of many of the graduates at the threatened loss of power and patronage brought about by the new Act, though of course some part of the opposition may be quite disinterested. To illustrate the popular (non-academic) attitude on such points, it may be worth noting that in the United Provinces a number of secondary schools which had been placed under the control of district boards were in 1907 "again placed under the management of the Education Department with, as the Lieutenant-Governor remarked, 'acclamations of approval.' There is indeed no greater mistake than to suppose that the transfer of the management of secondary schools from the provincial Government to local bodies is a concession to popular opinion" (*Quinquennial Review of Education in India*, 1902–1907). This would seem to show that public opinion (apart from the public opinion of the graduate class—the only fully articulate class in India, and according to Mr. Sharrock, *The Nineteenth Century*, September 1909, almost exclusively composed of Brahmins) is not against the "officializing" of educational institutions.

law and medicine. Because of these utilitarian[1] motives of the students and the imperfect realization by the bulk of the teachers of the true scope and objective of Western culture, the examinations have tended to assume undue prominence in the scheme, and the colleges have become, to a large extent, rival cramming institutions whose mutual jealousy defeats nearly every proposed reform in the curricula. Thus *books* and not *subjects* are prescribed, because of the handicap that the broader system would impose on the more poorly staffed colleges; the appointment of examiners is a matter of much inter-collegiate bitterness; frauds with regard to examination papers and results are of frequent occurrence; teachers who happen also to be examiners are accused of giving palpable hints to their classes as regards what questions are likely to come; and even when examination papers set by Englishmen are printed in European cities, leakage of information continues to occur. All this obviously creates an atmosphere which is not the most wholesome for a growing youth

[1] In a sense it may be said that the same utilitarian motives influence the bulk of University students in our own country. But most of the latter from the beginning of their training believe to some extent in the intrinsic value of education, and come from homes where similar beliefs are held. The Indian student of the type that reverences knowledge is more likely to be one who, despising the coarse materialism of Western thought, devotes himself to Oriental learning of a very different character.

to breathe. Failure, moreover, in examinations is economically a very serious matter to the candidate. He is usually poor, and his family's fortunes are largely embarked in the commercial venture of his training.[1] Naturally, therefore, he cannot turn aside to consider the value of what his Western teachers (if he has any) call culture. Even if he were interested in it, to do so might well involve injustice to his relatives. Moreover, young as he is, he is, as often as not, already a married man with some (though not many) of what we consider a married man's responsibilities. He therefore, if conscientious, devotes himself primarily to memorizing such lecture notes[2] as seem likely to be suitable for reproduction in the examination room.

[1] The Gains of Learning Bill, enabling an individual to keep to himself professional earnings of a kind that under Hindu Law would go to the family, provoked violent outcry when brought forward some years ago.

[2] The Indian theory of education has always laid stress on memory training. We Englishmen object to the University system of modern India that it subordinates everything to memory work. But I find an Indian, Dr. A. K. Coomaraswamy, when addressing the Tamils of Jaffna, making the reverse charge. "We do not find" (he says) "in Western education that training of the mental powers which we include under the name of *Yoga*. I do not mean to disparage Western mental training, which in many respects may be superior to ours, but it is undoubtedly a tendency at present to study many subjects superficially, to cram them up for special purposes from little text-books where all difficulties are carefully explained. Our own methods are superior in training the memory and producing that pointedness and concentration of mind which are associated with *Yoga*. Memory is of great

The examination papers need to be studied to be believed in. They are full of demands for information of the most worthless type; information which the examinees, even when supplying correctly, cannot possibly in many cases have fully understood, let alone assimilated. The sort of book which the Syndicates love to prescribe is represented by Ingram's *History of Political Economy*—a tissue of biographical notes, summaries of opinions, and criticisms of hundreds of authors whom the teachers, to say nothing of the taught, will never dream of consulting. This book I especially singled out for an onslaught on

importance to us. 'From breaking of memory cometh wreck of understanding, from wreck of understanding a man is lost,' says Bhagavad Gita. Let us not forget this in adapting our ancient to modern needs (of which an understanding of science and capacity for critical reasoning are chief). While aiming at them, let us strive to lose as little as possible of what good things we already possess" (Quoted, *Indian Education*, Bombay, October 1906). The registrar of an Indian University (himself an Indian) once explained to me that Indian schoolboys begin their study of English by committing to memory some four thousand idioms —a fact which may account for much of the eccentricity of 'Baboo English,' which on close examination will be found to resolve itself into a closely woven tapestry of endless idiomatic phrases, like a careful English scholar's Latin verse. Similarly, elementary mathematics is largely memory work; schoolboys learning by heart enormous multiplication tables (17 times 23, and so forth), including even fractional multiplications (such as $2\frac{1}{4}$ times $3\frac{1}{2}$). A very interesting description of the custom, and an account of the difficulty of getting village schoolmasters to deal in any different way even with modern science and nature study, will be found in Mr. H. Sharp's *Rural Schools in the Central Provinces* (Occasional Reports on Indian Education, 1904). See also *Quinquennial Review of Education*, 1902–7.

the score of its unsuitableness, when serving as a temporary professor in the Government service a few years ago. It was then prescribed for the benefit of the comparatively few students who took the Bombay M.A. examination in that subject. It is now, I notice, prescribed for the B.A. examination and taken by all candidates for that degree without exception.

§ 23. Dead Sea fruit we have been giving to the students in place of the bread of culture. With Dead Sea fruit and ashes we have fed them until they have come, many of them, to believe that these things *are* the bread of life; they grow angry with those who tell them otherwise, and are quick to impute sinister motives, declaring the sole aim of the reformers to be that of diminishing the supplies of bread with which the hungry would fain be fed. The bread of culture they do not ask for—believing that they have it; but they cry out continually for more, always more of this Dead Sea fruit—examination lore and academic degrees—not realizing that these accumulations of facts without worth are but bones without life—ashes and Dead Sea fruit, profitless, save to the self-seeking individual in an ignorant community, whom they benefit by bringing to him a higher dowry[1] with his wife, and by opening

[1] This is often a highly important consideration in the student's life.

out to him the avenues of Governmental employment.

Culture, the ordinary[1] Indian graduate believes that he possesses, in as full a measure as the Oxford or Cambridge men with whom he may happen to come into contact. He resembles the half-educated African—in the United States or at the Cape—but with a difference. To the Negro, culture is the capacity to pour out mellifluous polysyllables with incongruous fluency—a matter of fine linguistic feathers to be exhibited vainGloriously on all possible occasions. To the Hindu, it is the memorizing of many valueless facts, the contents of a recognized series of prescribed treatises[2] which his English professor (thus laying himself open to the secret mockery of the highly amused undergraduate) never succeeds in learning half so well as he, the pupil, who is unjustly kept down in subordinate positions by the racial arrogance of the brutal, strong-willed European.

[1] There are of course a considerable proportion of Indians whose broad culture and high intellectual powers win the respect of all Englishmen.

[2] I have had a student come to me in a state of acute intellectual distress because a moral maxim which appeared in Merivale's *History of the Romans* was incapable of being harmonized with another that he had noticed in one of Bacon's *Essays;* the idea that the general substance of the book could be prescribed in the one case as a subject to be studied in a different manner from that expected in the other having been completely missed.

§ 24. In this witches' medley of struggling pupils and wrangling lecturers the Government appears as the subsidizer of the better institutions, and the direct controller of a few definitely secular colleges, which compete in the examination arena against the rest. In these there goes on the usual preposterous round of unbroken second-rate lecturing[1] and diligent note-taking, over-worked "professors" talking for twelve or fourteen hours a week on the stretch and filling in their vacations by flooding the market with grotesque editions of English poets and essayists, wherein the original thoughts of the author lie buried under mountains of vain erudition.[2]

The examinations, it should be added, are not, as often alleged, of an easy kind. Indian graduates who have afterwards distinguished themselves at Cambridge declare that their Indian degrees were won only at the cost of severe study. But though difficult—much as London University examinations used to be difficult, and faulty—the

[1] "A school of opinion, however, is forming which condemns the excessive use of lecturing, and there are some beginnings of practical attempts to use other methods. The Madras inspecting body noticed as the greatest evil in the teaching of English the tendency to reduce to a minimum the work done by the students for themselves" (*Quinquennial Review*, 1902–1907, p. 55).

[2] The English members of the college staffs are themselves considerable offenders, for the occupation is fairly lucrative, and Government has not thought of prohibiting their activity.

Indian University examinations do not foster education. The examiner in India is (usually) the enemy, rather than the coadjutor, of the conscientious tutor interested in developing his pupils' minds. The achievement of an Indian degree (like the attainment under the old *régime* of a London B.A.) is no *prima facie* proof of the possession of sound culture, though it *is* proof of industry and ability. In other words the examination standards require to be raised in quality; they most certainly do not require to be raised in difficulty.[1]

§ 25. The Universities aim, necessarily, at being purely secular. It is probably true, however, that the apparent equity of treatment for the different religions in the case of examinations conducted by the Universities (including school-leaving examinations) involves, in practical working, consequences unfavourable to Christianity. For the curricula are largely literary rather than scientific; and while in the case of English literature distinctively religious works will be excluded,

[1] "The most striking feature about the numbers of graduates at the Indian Universities is not the magnitude of their total or any increase in it, but the very high proportion of wastage. It takes 24,000 candidates at matriculation to secure 11,000 passes, it takes 7000 candidates at the Intermediate examination to secure 2800 passes, and it takes 4750 candidates for the B.A. degree to secure 1900 passes. There are 18,000 students at college in order to supply an annual output of 1935 graduates (*Quinquennial Review of Education in India*, 1902–1907).

and even, at times, a preference will be given to such agnostic authors as John Stuart Mill, the same can hardly be the case with Sanskrit, Arabic, Persian, and (I believe) the vernacular literatures. "If nothing more is meant by combining religious with secular instruction than that literature, science, and art must rest on 'a distinctly religious basis,' and be pervaded by a religious spirit, there would seem to be little room for controversy as far as education in India is concerned; for the ancient literature, science, and art of India are saturated with religious thought, and, notwithstanding the storm and stress of modern life, books dealing with religion continue to form the largest proportion of Indian publications. These, for the most part, are the books used as text-books in the classical and vernacular languages."[1]

The missionary colleges do include distinctively Christian teaching in their curricula, but the advantages obtained therefrom are very dubious. For as Dr. Duncan, in a Memorandum (1888) on Moral Education, says, "the religious instruction which the orthodox Hindu youth receives in a mission school contradicts in numerous ways the thoughts and feeling of his family and his society. In school he is compelled, as a condition of his receiving secular instruction, to participate in, and show reverence for, a worship which in his

[1] Dr. Duncan, *Asiatic Quarterly*, January 1902.

heart he does not believe, which outside school he is accustomed to hear spoken of, it may be, with despite, and conversion to which would be regarded by his parents as the greatest calamity that could befall them and him. Is this the way to foster reverence for things sacred? Is it thus that habits of sincerity and truthfulness are acquired? Are the Hindus so little ready to sacrifice their convictions to their interests that we must catch them young and begin betimes to train them to tread this path of doubtful morality?"[1]

Genuine devotees of other religions allow their

[1] Quoted by Dr. Satthianadhan, *History of Education in the Madras Presidency* (Appendix).

Cf. also the following, which reinforce the same idea. "You do not make an education religious by trying to teach boys in school hours a religion they do not believe. This would be simply proselytism. And even if it were desirable, which it is obviously not, that the British Government in India should embark on a vast scheme of proselytism by teaching in all their schools and colleges the Christian scriptures, still this would be something quite distinct from a religious education" (the Bishop of Madras, "Higher Education in India," *The Nineteenth Century*, January 1905). "Religious teaching which is not believed and not acted upon is not only useless, but is often worse than useless. It accustoms the young to palter with religious truth, and to stand face to face with it for many years without even considering it worthy of a serious examination" (the Bishop of Madras, quoted by Dr. Duncan, "Is the Education System of India a Failure?" in *The Asiatic Quarterly*, January 1902). Obligatory attendance, adds Dr. Duncan in the same article, "would tend to encourage one of the besetting sins of Hindus; their readiness to live a double life—to show an outward acquiescence in the opinions of those in authority, however repugnant such opinions may be to their real convictions.'

children to attend the classes in which Christian doctrine is taught,—probably in most cases because they find the missionary schools the most economical; for (rather to the disgust of certain among them) there is no "conscience clause" in the Governmental rules with regard to state-aided colleges. As one of themselves says, "it cannot be pretended that these communities [the Mohammedans and the Hindus] are willing to have their children indoctrinated in Christianity for its own sake; they only put up with this state of things as a necessary evil and undergo its risks either because the absence of other institutions leaves them no alternative, or because the mission institutions offer substantial advantages of a non-religious kind which are not available elsewhere."[1] The stress, however, of examination competition against rival schools leads to the religious teaching being very severely compressed. "The Bishop of Madras voices the sentiments of missionary managers when he says that 'many changes have taken place of recent years which have made the religious education given in missionary colleges more and more difficult to maintain.' It is the same with earnest-minded teachers in non-mission schools; they all feel the difficulty, but at the same time the necessity, of striving against the

[1] Mr. V. S. Srinivasa Sastri, in *The Indian Review* (Madras), January 1905.

engrossing pursuit of those immediate and tangible results that aid directly in the struggle for existence."[1] "These institutions are at present dominated by secular universities, the requirements of which cramp religious and moral teaching."[2]

In order to hold their own against secular institutions the missionary colleges must devote their main energies to purely secular work, and that not of a very ennobling kind.[3] Religious lessons cannot be allowed to intrude very far on the hours required for teaching in preparation for examinations; and, if given after college hours to classes at which attendance is optional, they are not likely to touch more than a very small number. The same difficulty is felt by the non-Christian religious teachers. "Knowing as we do" (says a writer in the *Central Hindu College Magazine*[4]) "the difficulty in the present day of guarding religious instruction from being

[1] Dr. Duncan, *The Asiatic Quarterly*, January 1902; cf. also p. 163 of the same number, where a story is told of a Brahmin teacher in a missionary school giving, with mechanical professionalism, the Bible lesson.

[2] Sir Chas. Bernard, *A Christian University for India*, 1889 (quoted by Mr. A. C. Fraser, *Education in India*, p. 14).

[3] "The present 'Failure of Educational Missionary Institutions' must be traced also to the fact that they are exclusively employed in manufacturing candidates for the secular University examinations; they do not train up men for the public ministry" (*The Christian Citizen*, June 1907).

[4] November 1907.

utterly swamped by the demands of secular instruction, we are inclined to be sceptical as to results where this instruction is to be 'optional with the pupils' and 'given out of college hours.' Few youths are far-sighted enough to resist the strain of competitive examinations, and to find time for such an unsalable acquisition as an intelligent understanding of their religious and philosophical inheritance, and it would seem that it is for the authorities to make the gaining of such knowledge easy for them, by giving it a place on the regular curriculum. It is of vital importance to the people of India that their sons shall be able to meet scepticism with knowledge."

§ 26. We cannot aim, probably no experienced Englishman wishes that we should aim, at the compulsory inclusion in all schools of all sorts of religious instruction; if for no other reason, because many of the sectarian creeds have a decidedly anti-moral character, and their teaching would be subversive of that which we are most eager to forward.

"No one," writes Dr. Duncan,[1] "would recommend the teaching of any or every religious dogma in Indian schools; and until such beliefs as may, on moral grounds, be taught, are separated from such as may not be taught, the question of religious instruction must remain one on which

[1] Memorandum (1888) on Moral Education.

no practical policy can be adopted. My position is this: certain religious creeds are utterly immoral in the main dogmas, rendering it hopeless to look to them for help in training the young in habits of right conduct. Other creeds contain, mingled in varying proportions, beliefs some favourable and some unfavourable to virtue; and if they are to assist at all in moral training, the wheat must be separated from the chaff, those dogmas only being inculcated which make for virtue. If religious beliefs have thus to be subjected to a moral test before they can be admitted as subjects of instruction, what meaning can be attached to the popular opinion that morality is based on religion, or that religious instruction is the indispensable condition of moral training?"

Nor, when one considers the inflammable state of religious feeling in the country (nearly all the serious riots, and to some extent the Mutiny itself, being traceable to religious causes), can one declare that measures of compromise, such as might be suitable in England, would be very easy of application. Says the Education Commission of 1882: "The remedy proposed is that Government should employ teachers of all prevalent forms of religion to give instruction in its colleges, or should at least give such teachers admission to its colleges if their services are provided by outside bodies. We are unable to recommend any plan

of this kind. However praiseworthy the feelings that underlie such a proposal, we are satisfied that no such scheme can be reduced to practice in the present state of Indian society."[1]

[1] The motive of those natives who desire the inclusion of miscellaneous religious teaching in school curricula seems to be largely the hope of checking Christianizing tendencies. "The cry for religious education is founded on the vague impression existing in the minds of some educated Hindus that thereby they can put an end to Christian conversions . . . and also to the tendency . . . to adopt European fashions" (Mr. K. Sundaraman, *The Indian Review*, April 1902). "Hindus and Muhammadans . . . not unfrequently desire religious instruction for the express purpose of checking the undermining influence of Christianity on the native creeds" (Dr. Duncan, *The Asiatic Quarterly*, January 1902).

It is interesting to note that an attempt to supply miscellaneous religious instruction is to be made in the native state of Mysore, in consequence of a report submitted by the Inspector-General of Education, Mr. H. J. Bhabha.

"It appears to the Government that the proposals submitted by the Inspector-General are framed on correct lines, and would, if adopted, constitute a move in the right direction. They are accordingly pleased to sanction these proposals, and to direct that effect be given to them from November 1st, 1908.

"As recommended by the Inspector-General, the time to be given to religious and moral instruction will be limited to five periods a week, the first thirty minutes after roll-call being devoted thereto. There will be a moral discourse on Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays, and religious instruction on Tuesdays and Thursdays. The moral discourse will be common to pupils of all persuasions and be based on a text taken from some religious, moral, historical or literary work. In addition there will be specific teaching from books like the Sanatana Dharma Advanced Text-Book, the Koran, and approved commentaries and essays on the Muhammadan religion and the Bible. The curriculum suggested by the Inspector-General and the text-books recommended by him are approved for adoption in all Government institutions, to which alone the present scheme will be

Sir Theodore Morison has indeed advocated the endowment of residential colleges giving distinctive religious instruction (Hindu or Mohammedan) in districts where the population is fairly homogeneous; the Principal in each case being directed to enforce religious observances as a matter of college discipline and to prohibit practices which are forbidden by the law of the religion concerned. "I believe that morality so taught would have more power to influence conduct than any eclectic system of ethics which Government would be willing to enforce, because in India, at least, an ethical system is likely to be accepted in exact proportion as it has the sanction of religion, and a system which has not that sanction will not command more than a languid obedience."[1]

applied in the first instance, the question of extending the scheme to aided schools not under Government management being reserved for future consideration" (Quoted in Mr. Gustav Spiller's *Moral Education in Eighteen Countries*, 1909, p. 187).

[1] *Imperial Rule in India*, 1899, p. 125. Similarly Mr. Ameer Ali in *The Nineteenth Century*, October 1905, p. 614. "Personally I think it a mistake to endeavour to educate the youth of the different nationalities of India according to one uniform method. The difference in their ideals, religious standards, and ethical needs makes the task of maintaining the line of advance at an even pace for all the communities well nigh impossible. For this reason I have consistently advocated denominational universities, and suggested that the Hindoos, Mahommedans, and Christians should be educated and trained according to their own ethical standards, the Government if necessary laying down certain rules for 'hall-marking' the products of these universities for

Colleges on some such lines have been established, notably the great Mohammedan foundation at Aligarh, which seems to have grown into a centre of Mohammedan culture frequented by learners from lands as distant as Burma and Persia.[1] To this college the resolution of the Government of India on its educational policy (1904) refers as "a striking example of the success of the residential system." Another such institution, with which the name of Mrs. Besant is closely associated, is the Central Hindu College at Benares.[2]

Enthusiastic supporters of these institutions (Aligarh College and the Central Hindu College) look forward to the day when they will grow into great Mohammedan and Hindu Universities to which all the distinctively Mohammedan and Hindu colleges throughout India will ultimately affiliate themselves.

purposes of State-employment." Cf. also "University Education in India," in *The Indian Review*, October 1903, by Mr. H. J. Bhabha, Inspector-General of Education in Mysore, whose views are similar.

[1] For accounts of the aims of its founder, Sir Syed Ahmad Khan, and of the progress of the college, see *The Asiatic Quarterly* for October 1898 ("A Mahomedan University for Northern India," by Mr. J. Kennedy, I.C.S.), and *The Quarterly Review* for April 1906 ("An Indian Renaissance," by Sir Theodore Morison, late principal of Aligarh College).

[2] See also the *Contemporary Review*, January 1910, for an interesting account, by Sir A. Fraser, of the new foundation at Ranchi, where a system of denominational hostels is to be established round a non-sectarian college.

Thus the founders of Aligarh College in their address to Lord Lytton (1876):—"And looking at the difficulties which stood in our way and the success which has already been achieved, we do not doubt . . . that from the seed we sow to-day there will spring up a mighty tree whose branches, like those of the banyan of this soil, shall in their turn strike firm root into the earth and themselves send forth new and vigorous saplings; that this College will expand into a University whose sons shall go forth throughout the length and breadth of the land to preach the gospel of free inquiry, of large-hearted toleration and of pure morality." And the same hope is re-echoed in Sir A. P. Macdonnell's reply to an address of the trustees twenty years later:—"It is not too much to hope that this College will grow into the Mohammadan University of the future; that this place will become the Cordova of the East; and that in these cloisters Mohammadan genius will discover and, under the protection of the British Crown, work out that social, religious, and political regeneration of which neither Stamboul nor Mecca affords a prospect."[1]

The dream is a natural one. But there are obvious objections to the policy of forwarding it. Criticizing the aspirations with regard to Aligarh

[1] Quoted, *East and West* (Bombay), November 1902.

as set forth by a Mohammedan,[1] a Hindu writer, Mr. J. Sundararamaiya, points out that "if the dreams of Mr. Ibrahim Quraishi were to be realized, there is reason to fear that much of the good done to the Indian nation at large by the other Universities may be undone by this University. . . . One of the main functions of higher education is to remove racial prejudices and to create that catholic spirit in man which lays aside all religious differences and views the Indian nation as a whole."[2]

The advantages and disadvantages attaching to such schemes are not easy to balance. Possibly it would not be very wide of the mark to suggest that immediate benefits would accrue to individuals under the influence of the strengthened religious bodies, but that these benefits would in the long run be outweighed by the serious drawbacks attendant on the deepening of the chasm between the different communities. This, perhaps, is what the members of the Universities Commission of 1902 had in view when they declared that "in the present circumstances of India we hold that while no obstacle should be placed in the way of denominational colleges, it is important to maintain the undenominational character of the

[1] Mr. Md. Ibrahim Quraishi, "The Proposed Mussalman University," in *The Indian Review*, September 1902.

[2] *The Indian Review*, October 1902.

universities." Only in the denominational college is one likely in India to reap the full benefits of the residential system; but in the larger sphere of the University and the nation, denominationalism is the last thing that the Government should lend its aid to fostering.

§ 27. The policy of authorizing or enforcing simple Bible-reading in Governmental schools has of course been advocated from time to time, and even by non-Christians. Mr. Chas. L. B. Cumming (late of the Madras Civil Service) says that he "remembered being very much struck by a remark which was once made to him by an educated Brahmin in Madras, who said to him: 'I wish, sir, that your Government would show a little more backbone. I should like to see the Bible taught in our schools.' He said to the Brahmin: 'Surely you do not want your children to become Christians?' The Brahmin replied: 'No; but we admire the morality of the Bible, and we think it might be made a text-book just as any other books in the schools, and it would do our boys a great deal of good.'"[1]

But perhaps the best-known advocate of the policy is (or was) Bishop Welldon. "It is" (he writes) "possible—I will not say more—that before the new-born century passes to its grave

[1] Proceedings of the East India Association, *The Asiatic Quarterly*, July 1902.

the Government will feel able to enter upon a more religious educational policy. So long as there is no abuse of the religions of India, so long as there is no attempt to effect conversions by official influence, the people of India are not only willing, but, I think, even anxious, that their children should receive a religious education.[1] It would be a great reform, then, if it were one day feasible that in all schools and colleges the simple reading of the Bible, or certain parts of the Bible, should be permitted, provided always that any parent who objected to such reading should be readily allowed, under a conscience clause, to withdraw his children from being present at it."[2]

This utterance of the Bishop's was promptly stigmatized by the *Madras Mail* as "a suggestion which ran counter to all the pledges of religious impartiality, which forms the basis of British rule in India." And it may well be questioned, in view of the well-known explosiveness of Indian religious feeling, whether the adoption of a "conscience clause," as suggested by Bishop Welldon, would remove all grounds for suspicion, reasonable as well as unreasonable. "Few," says Dr. Duncan, "who have lived in India long enough to become acquainted with the character and inner

[1] For the motive probably underlying this desire, see footnote p. 76 *supra.*

[2] Quoted by Dr. Duncan, *The Asiatic Quarterly,* January 1902.

workings of native society will give an affirmative answer."

§ 28. We cannot use the resources of Government, obtained as they are by the taxation of a non-Christian population, to carry out any policy that savours, however remotely, of proselytizing. Our business is so to train the judgment of those who come to us for training that they may be the better qualified to see the relative strength and weakness of the rival creeds with which they make acquaintance. This training is in part a moral and in part an intellectual matter. The type of English books read will go for much; for the better portions of English classical literature embody the highest contemporary Christian sentiment on moral questions. The type of Englishman set to give the instruction will also count for much. And the whole course of non-literary studies *ought* to count too, in strengthening the intellectual faculties and clarifying the mental vision, substituting rational interests for irrational ones, and eliminating many of the sources of prejudice and passion. Thus Lord Curzon in his address to the Directors of Public Instruction, at Simla, September 1905: "We have deliberately severed religion from politics, and though we have our own church or churches we refrain, as an act of public policy, from incorporating Church with State. But we do not therefore lay down that

ethics are or should be divorced from the life of the nation, or that society, because it does not rest upon dogmatic theology, should lose the moral basis without which in all ages it must sooner or later fall to pieces. For Education is nothing unless it is a moral force. There is morality in secular text-books as well as in sacred texts, in the histories and sayings of great men, in the example of teachers, in the contact between teachers and pupils, in the discipline of the class-room, in the emulation of school-life. These are the substitutes in our Indian Educational system for the oracles of prophets or the teaching of divines. To them we look to make India and its people better and purer. If we thought that our education were not raising the moral level we should none of us bestir ourselves so greatly about it. It is because it is the first and most powerful instrument of moral elevation in India that it must for ever remain a primary care of the State."[1]

[1] Cf. the Government's Resolution of 1904. "The remark has often been made that the extension in India of an education modelled upon European principles, and so far as Government institutions are concerned, purely secular in character, has stimulated tendencies unfavourable to discipline and has encouraged the growth of a spirit of irreverence in the rising generation. . . . In Government institutions . . . the remedy for the evil tendencies noticed above is to be sought, not so much in any formal methods of teaching conduct by means of moral text-books or primers of personal ethics, as in the influence of carefully selected and trained teachers, the maintenance of a high standard of discipline, the institution of well-managed hostels, the proper selection of text-

§ 29. But before we begin to criticize secular education in India from the standpoint of results we must realize clearly that it has many other characteristics besides being secular.

For one thing, secular education in India is grotesquely exotic. It is inappropriate for nearly all purposes except that of supplying the kind of underlings required by our bureaucracy. It is not based on any widespread school system. It attempts to supply a sort of skeleton culture of a distinctively Western (and therefore alien) type, to students who cannot command the apparatus necessary even for a modestly satisfactory education—books, solitude for study, easy supplementary reading, a cultured home-circle, and intellectual companionships. "The surroundings of an Indian student are not always favourable for the development of a high type of character. Neither in the labour nor in the recreations of those about him does he find much that sorts with his intellectual pursuits. Living in an atmosphere of ignorance, his sense of superiority is in danger of becoming conceit. Reverence for the current forms of the religion of his country seems difficult to him when face to face with dogmas which science has exploded, and a

books such as biographies, which teach by example, and above all in the association of teachers and upils in the common interests of their daily life."

disposition to scoff does not beautify his nature. . . . The narrow circle of his life; the absence of facilities for travel, whereby his sympathies and experience might be enlarged; the strong temptation to lay aside his studies so soon as employment supplies his moderate necessities; the scanty inducement to fit himself for higher duties,—all help to dwarf the moral and intellectual growth, and to foster those faults against which satirists, good-humoured or bitter, have directed so many shafts. All the greater, therefore, is the credit given to him when he rises above the influences by which he is surrounded; and, whatever his weaknesses, it may be safely said that they who best know the educated native have the most to urge in his favour."[1]

We attempt such absurdities as the imparting, through the medium of an acquired language, a

[1] Report of the Education Commission of 1882. Cf. also the following:—"Done with school he is done with education, just about the age when the minds of his English boy contemporaries are beginning to open to ideas of public duty. The whole environment of 'our boys' in every walk in life tends to good citizenship, that of 'young India' to bad citizenship in our sense of the term. Masses of Indian boys learn English very much as ours do French or German, but in after life, perhaps, one in a score keeps up and improves his knowledge. The large majority revert to their own vernacular, and in it only read newspapers and translations of trashy and often demoralizing English books. This generalization applies certainly to Northern India. To what extent it is true for Lower Bengal, Madras, and Bombay, I am not sure" (Mr. S. S. Thorburn, *Asiatic Quarterly*, July 1902).

distorted knowledge of Greek and Roman history —Roman constitutional history even—to students who lack the most rudimentary knowledge of Greek and Latin. We further attempt to drill such students in the study of English constitutional struggles and achievements while ignoring almost entirely what would be to them the solidly useful study of English economic history. We are amazed and indignant that Indian students should think the former has any practical bearing on their own status and their own careers; we are disgusted at the same time that the nation continues economically helpless.[1]

The Indian University man has studied English constitutional history and practice, and is eager (over-eager, most of us think him) to apply what he has learned. He is not stubbornly unimitative.

Wherever the opportunity offers, he seeks to follow out what seem to him to be English constitutional principles. Take the case of the Uni-

[1] Incidentally it is worth noting—if for no other reason, to illustrate Lord Curzon's remarks, quoted p. 18, n., *supra*, with regard to the difficulties attendant on educational reform—that when the University of Calcutta recently diminished the relative importance of English Constitutional History in its curriculum, there were numerous and vigorous protests on the ground that "with the ignorance of English history, liberal aspirations and a desire to have a voice in the administration of our country will be markedly checked" (Speech of Mr. Parameshwar Lal before the Indian National Congress, 1908).

versities Act of 1904. It was loosely worded, and in consequence the vice-regal Government which carried through the measure found, when the University authorities attempted to put it into force in the manner that had all along been intended, that Indian graduates, by appealing in the courts to the precise wording of the Act, were able to stultify official action. Here was a triumph for constitutionalism! A living example of "the Rule of the Law" of which Dicey talks so beautifully—a Government checked by its own courts in its attempted illegal activity! But what were the practical results of the appeal? Merely that the Universities were temporarily paralysed—unable, for instance, to pay their grants to exhibitioners at Oxford and Cambridge, or to perform other more or less important functions, until the Government could rush through a validating Act to permit what it had intended to permit from the beginning.

The typical Indian is a docile subject for educational experiment. He has no intellectual initiative. He absorbs; and if he does not always absorb wisely, that is perhaps the fault of those who prescribe his curriculum, rather than of himself.

To some extent it is the fault of his previous training and his early environment—that is to say, the fault of his parents and of his forefathers

in general. But an "advanced" education which is prescribed for him without careful consideration of its adaptability to this preliminary training and social environment is not prescribed in the fullness of wisdom. "Those who criticize University education and University government" (I quote Mr. Yusuf Ali again),[1] "even in its unregenerate days, forget that what is generally responsible for the disappointing results is the material supplied at the source. You cannot make a silk purse out of a sow's ear. You cannot turn out advanced students . . . if you begin with raw material which cannot assimilate or respond to your methods, and over the production of which you had no control."

The typical Indian is a docile student[2] eager to learn. An English professor in the Indian Educational Service was commissioned in 1904 to make a tour in Japan and report on Japanese systems of instruction. On his return he was eagerly questioned by Indian students. They wanted to be told of some book about Japan that would explain everything: how the Japanese began in arts and science and self-government and diplomacy, how

[1] *Life and Labour of the People of India*, 1907, p. 132.

[2] Sir Theodore Morison, late Principal of Aligarh College, and now member of the Legislative Council of India, holds a similar view of his moral aptitude. "My own experience" (he says, *Imperial Rule in India*, p. 118) "is that the student in India is far more amenable than the English schoolboy, or irreverent undergrad, to the influence of his teacher."

they progressed in peace, how they succeeded in war. There *must* be some such book. And when all the Indians had read it, and learnt it by heart, they too could all go and do likewise.

The story is typical. The Indian student is humbly eager to learn.

§ 30. The educational machinery is obviously gravely defective. Teachers, officials, the general public, are unanimous on the point. "We found" (says Lord Curzon, of the investigations during his term as Viceroy) "Primary Education suffering from divergence of views as to its elementary functions and courses, and languishing nearly everywhere for want of funds. In Secondary Education we found schools receiving the privilege of recognition upon most inadequate tests, and untrained and incompetent teachers, imparting a course of instruction devoid of life to pupils subjected to a pressure of examinations that encroached upon their out-of-school hours, and was already beginning to sap the brain power as well as the physical strength of the rising generation. Inferior teaching in Secondary schools further has this deleterious effect, that it reacts upon College work and affects the whole course of University instruction, of which it is the basis and starting-point. We found these schools in many cases accommodated in wretched buildings, and possessing no provision for the boarding of the pupils. . . . We

found in some of the affiliated colleges a low standard of teaching and a lower of learning, ill-paid and insufficient teachers, pupils crowded together in insanitary buildings, the cutting down of fees in the interest of an evil commercial competition, and management on unsound principles. Finally, coming to the Universities, we found courses of study and a system of tests which were lowering the quality while steadily increasing the volume of the human output; students driven like sheep from lecture-room to lecture-room and examination to examination; text-books badly chosen, degrees pursued for their commercial value, the Senates with overswollen numbers selected on almost every principle but that of educational fitness, the Syndicates devoid of statutory powers—a huge system of active but often misdirected effort over which, like some evil phantom, seemed to hover the monstrous and maleficent spirit of 'Cram.'"[1]

§ 31. To find fault with the principle of secular education in India on the score of the quality of the products of an admittedly unsatisfactory secular system would be as unjust as to abuse the principle of religious education on the ground that in India it, too, is found to be full of similar defects. (In both cases the shortcomings

[1] Speech at the Simla Educational Conference, September 20, 1905.

are largely due to the inadequacy of equipment to deal with so huge a mass of human beings.) Of such deficiencies in the missionary schools and colleges there is no lack of evidence. "Many of our colleges and schools" (says the Rev. W. E. S. Holland, Warden of the Oxford and Cambridge Hostel, Allahabad) "are failing adequately to realize their unique possibilities as an evangelistic agency among the more cultured classes. The reason lies in the ghastly pressure of secularization which results from disastrous undermanning of mission colleges. In a typical case, three missionaries have to work a college and school of 1000 students. Lecturing and administration leave neither leisure nor strength for personal contact with the students."[1]

§ 32. Of course all our educational work in India, Governmental and missionary, is in a special sense experimental. It is tentative, and liable to frequent revisions and reversals of policy, to a higher degree than similar work in white countries ought ever to be. "The modern system of education in India is still in its infancy, and what it will grow to remains to be seen. The present is a time of intellectual revolution and change, when new ideas are coming into collision with the habits and traditions of centuries, and

[1] *Pan-Anglican Congress Report*, 1908, Vol. V, p. 31. See also the quotations on pp. 72, 73, *supra*.

the new wine is bursting the old bottles. In such an age of transition, when Englishmen, who do not understand the genius of the East, are attempting to create a system of education for Indians, who do not understand the genius of the West, it would be unreasonable to expect ideal perfection, and we ought not to be disappointed if we find that the results, whether intellectual or moral, are not wholly satisfactory."[1]

§ 33. Not least among the drawbacks under which college teachers labour is the necessity they are under, as a consequence of the victory of Lord Macaulay and the Anglicizers over the Orientalists, of striving to impart their knowledge through what is to their pupils a foreign language. Comparatively few of the students are confident masters of English, and probably very few indeed are capable of *thinking* in English. Yet practically all their instruction comes to them by way of lectures delivered in English and books written in English, and they are required later to disgorge their knowledge in English for the benefit of examiners. Naturally they tend to devote their energies to memorizing notes, and often with grotesque results.[2]

[1] The Bishop of Madras, "Higher Education in India," *The Nineteenth Century*, January 1905.

[2] I was once examining a class of students in Greek History (rather an outrageous subject for an Indian College!) and was particularly struck with the excellence, as regards both matter

§ 34. The "advanced" instruction given in the Indian Universities is inappropriate for nearly all good purposes[1] except that of supplying Government clerks and minor officials. Being inappropriate for good purposes it serves instead some very bad purposes.

When we framed our University schemes and threw our courses open—very cheaply[2]—to all who chose to avail themselves of them, we did not guarantee that all who passed through the courses would profit, economically or politically, in con-

and manner, of one candidate's answers. Three out of four questions were answered admirably. But the fourth began with the startling statement that "Greece is a land of peninsulas and islands let to the Greeks by the sea-farming people." By careful comparison with other answers I was able to reconstruct the lecturer's dictated note, which this industrious youth had heard mistily, copied down hastily, and painstakingly learned by heart. "The fact that Greece is largely made up of peninsulas and islands led to the Greeks becoming a sea-faring people." (Similar absurdities might of course be quoted from the answers of examinees in England; but hardly, I think, from the papers of students who show in the rest of their work unmistakable thoroughness and what looks like really high ability.)

[1] Sir Henry Craik even goes so far as to describe it as fitted "to develop all that is worst in the Oriental mind."

[2] In all Arts Colleges taken together, the average fee realized in 1901–2 was Rs. 57.5, in 1906–7 Rs. 60.1 (say £4), per annum. Mr. Principal Selby, however, argues (*East and West*, Bombay, November 1901) that not only is the cost of higher education fairly considerable when one takes into account average Indian incomes, but the Indian parent bears a larger proportion of the expense of education than the parents of such boys in England as are capable enough to win college scholarships. (The average income per head in India seems to be between 20 and 30 rupees per annum; in England £40 to £50 per annum.)

sequence. So we assert. But what is the use of such assertion? The Indian is not accustomed, as we have been accustomed for generations, to a Governmental policy of *laissez-faire*, a policy of allowing each of us to find his true competitive level, and of washing the hands of all consequences.

No one in England would dream of abusing the Principals of our Technical Schools, or even the County Councils that give Technical School Scholarships, because all who go through the Technical courses do not succeed in getting appropriate appointments at an adequate salary. But the Indian is accustomed to think of Government as essentially paternal. His rulers in the distant past may have been wicked rulers, sometimes, but then, such things as wicked parents are not unknown, even in the communistic village. The Englishman is the successor of these paternal rulers. "He is our father and our mother," and it is his business to prevent his people from wasting their substance in unremunerative education. The British Raj has taken the place of the Hindu deities. It has even become responsible for flood and famine. And if it cannot, like Providence, harness the rainstorm and control the rivers, it can at least—it ought to, and it must—give just compensation for the damage that rain or drought may do. How much

more must it deal with poverty induced by study at Government schools![1]

The English Government has been supplying its trusting subjects with an inappropriate academic training. It has upset the equilibrium of supply and demand in the clerical labour market. It has openly, wilfully—so the Indian must think—led guileless youths astray. It has neglected a public duty, the duty of paternal watchfulness. Is it matter for wonder if its indifference to an obvious duty should have begotten in the sufferers an angry desire to repudiate the claim of the rulers that it is the duty of subjects to be loyally obedient? As an Indian M.P.[2] puts it: "You may give as many moral precepts as you like in class-rooms; you may have your missionary classes and Sunday schools for religious teaching even; but, if you do not provide the students with the necessary train-

[1] "It was easy to predict that our well-meant efforts to disseminate Western culture would have certain definite and undesirable results. Education being regarded as a step to Government employment, the transition was natural to the singular faith that Government employment must be found for all who were educated. The native mind, for all its subtlety and cuteness, is often robustly and almost terrifyingly illogical. The native mind has never been able to discern clearly between two propositions. All native employees of the Government must be educated, and all educated natives must be employees of the Government. That mental obtusity lies at the root of all the unrest which makes itself most audible in England" (Mr. Justice Beaman, "The Situation in India," *The Empire Review*, February 1909).

[2] Sir Mancherjee Bhownaggree, *Journal of the Royal Colonial Institute*, March 1908.

ing for earning their livelihood, a good deal of your teaching will go wrong, and you will fail to make good citizens of them."[1]

We have made discontent justifiable in the eyes of Indian students. Further than that, we have made it effectively articulate. The training that should have turned out a capable clerk has succeeded. It has turned out something requiring much more skilled preparation than a clerk—a seditious journalist, an eloquent mob orator.[2]

[1] Cf. Mr. S. S. Thorburn's "Education by Newspaper" in *The Asiatic Quarterly*, July 1902. "If I am right, the conclusion seems to me irresistible that our educational system, as it operates, cannot tend to make its products contented with their lot. It suddenly drops them with their awakened faculties in chaos. Whether they mature into good or bad citizens of the Empire is left, so far as the Government is concerned, to chance. 'A little knowledge is a dangerous thing,' and the little they have is enough to give them inflated ideas of their own value. Thus 'Young India' starts in life with a grievance—Why did the Government educate him on Western lines if the end of it was to be a full brain and an empty stomach?" Cf. *The Edinburgh Review*, October 1907, p. 272: "Some years ago an Italian priest, the head of a missionary college in India, speaking of the number of discontented young men that pass through the educational mill in his own and in other colleges, remarked, 'These are the men that cause revolutions among us in Italy.'"

[2] In qualification of the above paragraphs I must quote some remarks of Sir Theodore Morison: "But even if it were proved that a large number of graduates fail to find lucrative employment, I should still reject the popular theory that they spend their time in writing seditious articles, because I am convinced that journalism does not pay. . . . I could mention many newspapers which are run at a loss, and I have had no personal experience of any which were a source of profit" (*Imperial Rule in India*, p. 100). Sir Theodore Morison, however, is very much an official apolo-

§ 35. "As suitable employment could not be provided for all those educated on Western lines, a class of clever and discontented men has gradually sprung up which is doing all it can to misrepresent and thwart British aims, to hinder

gist, believing, indeed, that apologetics is one of the important functions of government in a country like India (*ibid.*, p. 107 *et passim*). As regards those who succeed in getting University degrees, his statements may perhaps be correct enough. Thus Mr. Krishna Chandra Roy, in a pamphlet published in Calcutta, 1882 (*High Education and the present position of the graduates of Calcutta University*), analyses the occupations taken up, as far as facts are available. Of a total of 1350, whose careers he can trace, 528 are in Government service, 517 connected with law (some of these, of course, may also be discontented journalists), 163 teachers outside Government service, 88 students, and only 54 in other lines. Similar figures are supplied by Dr. Duncan for Madras (see "Education in India," by the Rev. J. Johnston, in the *Journal of the Statistical Society*, 1883): Government employment, 348; Native States service, 68; law, 92; teaching, 118; students, 103; other occupations, 67. But as regards the number of partially educated persons who fail to find lucrative employment, the calculations of Mr. S. S. Thorburn (see *The Asiatic Quarterly*, July 1902, "Education by Newspaper"), seems to show, fairly conclusively, that it cannot be small. Of an estimated annual 90,000 who go out into the labour market with some measure of secondary education, he calculates that only 2500 (or one in forty) can obtain Governmental posts at £20 a year and upwards. "The great bulk of the educated candidates for Government employment" (he says) "must struggle for positions worth less than £20 a year; in point of fact, they eagerly accept clerical posts no better paid than are the *sepoys* of our army." (Further remarks of Mr. Thorburn's on journalistic employment are quoted pp. 157, 158, *infra.*) Cf. Mr. S. M. Mitra's *Indian Problems*, 1908, p. 29: "Crowds of disappointed, discontented young men have been produced; the annual vacancies in the Government Services are not enough 'to go round,' so that the professions of law, journalism, and sedition never want for recruits." Cf. *The Edinburgh Review*, October 1907, p. 273: "The Maharajah of Kashmir, in

the regular course of administration and undermine its stability, and to transform slumbering racial prejudices into active antagonism and violent hatred."[1]

Similar quotations in support of the conclusion here drawn might be multiplied almost without

a public speech last July, said that the chief cause of disloyalty was the educational system, which sent out students with University degrees, but without occupation. The remedy lay in education in the arts and sciences, and this was the policy which he intended to follow in future." The writer of the Government's last Quinquennial Review of the Progress of Education in India (1902–7) adopts, however, a more optimistic tone. "It is sometimes supposed" (he writes, p. 34) "that the output of graduates from the Indian Universities is in excess of the number for whom there is employment; and indeed it is very common for persons who write about the social and political condition of India to treat this supposition as if it were a demonstrated fact, and to build upon it the theory that the presence in the country of a large body of graduates seeking employment and finding none is the cause of some disorders in the State." He gives the annual output of graduates, in all branches except law, as about 1400, and remarks that "the colleges and secondary schools, if they were able to offer salaries sufficiently attractive, would be capable of absorbing as teachers nearly the whole of this number." The "*if*," however, destroys all the cogency of the remark as far as it bears on social discontent. He adds that a return made in 1903 showed that Indians were employed in more than 16,000 posts in the public service at a pay exceeding Rs. 75 (£5) a month. But the fact that the public service had already absorbed the output of ten or twelve years of the University education mill is not in itself very consoling, without any figures being given of the average number of vacancies to set against the continued output. Nor must the very high proportion of students who stop short in the middle of their University course be forgotten (see figures quoted, p. 69, n., *supra*).

[1] Mr. J. Nisbet, "India under Crown Government," *The Nineteenth Century*, November 1908.

limit. But to what extent their grievances have made the educated natives not merely discontented (after the manner in which Englishmen are prone to show their discontent with their personal opportunities and with the methods of the Government of the day), but also seriously disaffected and hostile to British policy, is more open to doubt. "The education we give them" (says Sir G. Birdwood, in the *Bombay Gazette*[1]) "unfits them for any work required of them in India beyond service under the Government and our Courts of Justice and in the practice of medicine. . . . It has disgusted them with their own homes, their parents, their sisters, their very wives.[2] It has brought discontent into every family as far as its baneful influences have reached. . . . My own experience of the educated classes is that they are fervently loyal, but they feel their helpless, humiliating position bitterly, and are bitterly discontented and disgusted not with the British Raj, but the utter 'cursedness' of the insoluble dilemma of their position."

Thus we have to face the fact that the system of education is not only unsatisfactory in itself, con-

[1] Quoted in *The Indian Review* (Madras), June 1907.

[2] This, of course, applies very much more to the Indians who are attracted to England by the advantages of an English University education, and while in England catch some glimpses of English home life.

sidered as an intellectual discipline, and open to the charge of being still more unsatisfactory as lacking in the elements necessary for moral discipline; it is also unsatisfactory in relation to the life-careers of those who come under it.[1]

Some very cogent remarks upon the whole situation are supplied by Mr. Principal Selby.

[1] None of these complaints and criticisms is confined to quite recent writings. In Sir R. Lethbridge's *High Education in India* (1882) I find, for instance, the following (p. 133):—"There are those who think that our State colleges annually turn out a number of disaffected and discontented young men, who become useful and loyal citizens only so long as they can be employed by the Government, and whose knowledge is in most other cases ready to be turned to evil account. There are also those who think that the necessarily undenominational character of the education given in State colleges tends to irreligion and even to immorality. And once more there are those who think that the easiest solution of the difficulty of providing adequate employment for the educated gentlemen of India is to be found in cutting off the supply by maiming the colleges. . . . It may be admitted that in India, as in every other civilized country of the earth, a provision of the means of high education adequate to the needs of the country is attended and followed by some over-crowding of the more desirable professions. But this is an evil that everywhere else has been found to work its own remedy. . . . Nor are there wanting signs that our Indian University men are beginning to appreciate the attractions of other lines of life than those at first sought by them." And Lord Ripon, addressing the University of Bombay in 1884, spoke as follows:—"It seems to me, I must confess, that it is little short of folly that we should throw open to increasing numbers the rich stores of Western learning; that we should inspire them with European ideas, and bring them into the closest contact with English thought; and that then we should, as it were, pay no heed to the growth of those aspirations which we have ourselves created, and the pride of those ambitions we have ourselves called forth. To my mind, one of the most important, if it be also one of the most difficult, problems of the

"In other countries" (he says)[1] "the general level of knowledge and information is fairly high. There is pretty generally diffused a shrewd common-sense and a keen practical judgment to which a man, not only on his entrance into life but also throughout his life, has to approve himself. He has to measure his forces against the shrewd men of the world that give distinction to the learned professions, and compose the great commercial and business interests. All these are disposed to give a fair start to a young man. But they will try him by their own tests. They will not take him at his own valuation; nor will they regard any distinction which he may have gained as a student as more than presumptive evidence of capacity. The world's tests are in many ways very different from those of the University. But in India the graduates of the University are the people so far as it is articulate—with those who govern, with the leaders of the learned professions, with hard-headed business men, the majority of them have little or nothing to do. They are, as it were, a little world by themselves. On most subjects their information

Indian Government in these days, is how to afford such satisfaction to those aspirations and to those ambitions as may render the men who are animated by them the hearty advocates and the loyal supporters of the British Government" (Quoted in *India*, 15 January, 1904, p. 30).

[1] "University Education in India," *East and West* (Bombay), November 1901.

is, under the circumstances inevitably, very imperfect, and their opinions consequently crude, yet subjected to no correction. 'When a man cannot measure,' says Plato, 'and a great many others who cannot measure declare that he is four cubits high, can he help believing what they say?' This, so far as education is responsible for it, is the secret of the vague discontent which finds expression in popular newspapers. Not being habitually confronted by intelligence and knowledge superior to their own, they come to overvalue themselves, to grow impatient of correction when they do meet it, and to find fault with an order of things in which their claims, as measured by themselves, are not regarded as rights which society must in justice concede."

§ 36. The remedy for the general maladjustment is not easy to discover. Mechanical devices for reducing the numbers of undergraduates—the raising of fees, for example—will not lead to much less suffering, and will certainly not lead to a much greater contentment with English ideas of justice. In any case it is inadvisable to check the spread of what small modicum of enlightenment the present system does supply.[1]

[1] "The benefits which higher education has conferred, small as the progress has been, will be readily conceded, and His Excellency in Council is convinced that any action which checked its development would be a serious misfortune. Young men of education are wanted in the interests alike of the efficiency and

A wider extension of technical education is often urged as a remedy. "A great mistake we have been making in India" (writes Sheikh Abdul Qadir, editor of the *Lahore Observer*[1]) "is that we have been wearing the cast-off clothes of England, as it were, by taking whatever was in vogue in England, without keeping pace with the progress of education in the West, or without thinking how much of the English system we really needed and how much of it would be a luxury in which a poor people like ourselves should not indulge. The opening of eyes in this respect I regard as a great moral gain, and if it results in giving India, at least in the many indigenous institutions that are fast springing up in the country, an education that would combine the practical side of instruction with the ideal, and would supply

the purity of the administration of the State, for the extension of primary and secondary instruction and for the development of the trade, the industries and the resources of the country. And what is the supply? The Madras University serves a population of at least fifty millions, and yet the number of graduates in Arts in 1900 was only 365, while in 1901 it was not more than 331, and in no year in the past decade has it reached 500. The number of students on the rolls of colleges is practically the same now as it was in 1890–91, and any attempt to make this branch of education self-supporting or even materially to increase the contribution demanded from those who benefit by it must result in a serious falling off in the number of students, which His Excellency in Council would view with grave apprehensions" (Extract from an official letter written by the Government of Madras, 1902).

[1] "India in Transition," *East and West* (Bombay), January 1907.

the needs of the agricultural and industrial population as much as those of the literary and the clerical, it would mean a great step in the direction of material progress."

One plan has been suggested and partly put into practice. Studentships for the study of technical processes have been instituted, and picked Indians have been sent with Governmental money to learn practical arts in Europe. But the prospects of success seem very dubious. The ordinary B.A. could usually find some form of employment for which his academic career would give him some slight advantage. But what career lies open to the Hindu who has studied metallurgy or civil engineering? Will any investor, English or Indian, be willing to lend him the capital with which he may put his knowledge to the venture of competitive production? Will any English firm in India be eager to give him a place of trust?[1]

[1] Thus a Committee of the Chamber of Commerce for Upper India expresses itself on the point as follows: "So far as the organized industries of these provinces are concerned, it is not thought that specially trained scholars, who have undergone such a course of studies as is contemplated by the Government of India's scheme, would be of any material value. These students would presumably expect to be installed in positions of trust and importance, and as it is not considered that it would be possible for them in the time at their disposal to gain more than a limited and circumscribed acquaintance with the practical details of the particular industries they had selected for their studies, it would be extremely doubtful that the heads of important concerns would

§ 37. We are attempting here to correlate the educational system as a whole, and more especially in its external aspects, with the possibilities of developing a sense of duty, and more especially of political duty in those subjected to its working. Incidentally one aspect, again the external aspect, of the frequently proposed importing of a Christian element into it should be noted.

When we talk of the relation between Christian religious teaching and the stimulating of a sense of political duty, we are likely to overlook the importance of the fact that Christianity is in India an imported religion, an alien, an exotic. Now allegiance to an imported, foreign creed is seldom fully compatible with a genuine patriotism. In Elizabeth's reign, could a patriotic Englishman be a Roman Catholic? Could a patriotic Irishman be an Anglican? Sometimes, perhaps; but very

regard them as qualified to replace European experts, possessing years of practical experience, in the more responsible appointments. On the other hand, the very fact of their being favoured by such special selection at the hands of Government as is indicated in the memorandum under consideration would be calculated to render them unfitted in their own estimation for the more subordinate positions in mills and factories" (*Quinquennial Review of Education*, 1902–7, p. 192). In spite of this, however, it should be noted that "a European firm, that of Messrs. Wallace and Co., Bombay, had shown sufficient faith in the technical training of Indian employés to send home a Hindu, employed at their mill at Sholapur, to go through the textile industry course at the Manchester School of Technology" (*ibid.*, p. 192). The experiment is, of course, still too young for any decisive judgment to be passed on its practical value.

rarely. Can a patriotic Indian become any more easily (without sacrificing much of his patriotism) a Christian? Writing of Northern India, the Rev. C. F. Andrews says: "The intellectual Indians, who are strong and independent, and who by their character and originality will be the leaders of the future, are not troubling themselves about the sanctity of the Vedas or the verbal inspiration of the Quran. . . . Their spiritual nature is at present absorbed in the prospect of an awakening East, of an Indian nationality, of a free and enlightened people, of a deliverance from the nightmare of superstition and the tyranny of caste. . . . They are the men in India who are alive, they are the men who will mould and shape the future. Sadly enough, however, these are the very men who are repelled by the present aspect of the Christian Church in India. Though Christ is venerated by them, the Church appears the Church of the foreigner, with the great proportion of its clergy in the pay of a foreign government and acting as State officials. To become a member of the Christian Church is to them to become denationalized and semi-European."[1]

Mr. Andrews is unable to say how far this is true of other parts of India; and, indeed, he is inclined, it would seem, to modify his statement in

[1] "The Situation in the East," *The East and the West*, October 1907.

various directions by pointing out other signs of a more hopeful kind. Yet that it is substantially true seems clear from the witness of other writers of experience.[1]

This fact should be borne in mind whenever the issue is raised afresh as to whether it is or is not advisable to introduce something of Christian teaching into the schools or colleges of India. Such a change of educational policy has been urged in the past even by non-Christians. As quoted by Mr. A. G. Fraser,[2] a Hindu judge writes: "The moral education of our youth is almost a blank. In missionary schools the Bible is taught, but other schools shut that wonderful book out. The cry that perpetually assails our ears is that Bible-reading contributes to denationalization and conversion to the faith of

[1] Cf. Mr. J. Kennedy's "The Tendencies of Modern Hinduism" (*The East and the West*, April 1905): "Among the educated classes the duel between Christianity and Hinduism is in part a patriotic conflict"; and Sir Theodore Morison's "An Indian Renaissance" (*The Quarterly Review*, April 1906): "What is commonly called the bigotry and prejudice of the Maulvis is in many cases only attachment to the old forms of Muhammadan society, and ought more justly to be described as a quasi-patriotic sentiment. . . . Their patriotism is necessarily expressed in terms of religion, because Islam is the name both of a creed and a society, and the two ideas of religion and patriotism are covered by a single term." "For a native of India to accept the British religion is to run counter to the prevailing anti-British and pro-Indian feeling; it is unpatriotic to become a convert to Christianity" (Rev. J. Morrison, D.D., *New Ideas in India*, 1907, p. 190).

[2] *The East and the West*, January 1908, p. 29.

Jesus. . . . A more irrational cry it is impossible to conceive. . . . As a matter of practical expediency it is far better that a few should embrace the faith of Christ than that the bulk of our students should lead the life of practical atheists. English education has hitherto done the work of destruction, so far as our religious belief is concerned, and it would really be a social disaster to let religious belief remain in its present state."

Here we have a Hindu advocating the introduction of the Bible into the schools. But it should be noted that even he brackets "conversion" with "denationalization." Others, less broad-minded, are likely to consider, and do consider, the correlation fatal.

CHAPTER IV

§ 38. THE effects of Western education in destroying in the minds of Asiatics the restraining influences of non-Christian religions have often been remarked. "The testimonies on this point are numerous and worthy of respect. Macaulay himself declared that 'no Hindu who has received an English education ever remains sincerely attached to his religion.' Many others speak even more strongly than this, but it will be sufficient to quote a passage written long ago in a Bombay native paper, the earnest tone of which proves its sincerity: 'Education provided by the State simply destroys Hinduism; it gives nothing in its place. It is founded on the benevolent principle of non-interference with religion, but in reality it is *the negation of God in life*. Christians holding a faith pure and rational in its essentials may receive the highest education, and be only the more confirmed in their faith. But education must destroy idolatry, and State education in India, benevolent in its idea, practically teaches atheism.' This utterance of a non-Christian . . . accords only

too closely with the personal experience of those of us who have been in India and have been interested in the students of Government schools."[1]

According to Bishop Whitehead, of Madras,[2] secular education "is removing the old landmarks, disintegrating family life, sapping the foundations of society, and bringing the educated classes of India face to face with a moral chaos in which they will find no fixed principles of moral or social life, and no guarantee even of intellectual and material progress." "Purely secular instruction," writes Mr. Rees,[3] "is given in our schools, and experience shows that this is not supplemented by moral instruction at home, so that not only the British in India, but all the natives, except those who are themselves the product of our system, unite in condemning the results. The Indian graduates are too often youths without any sense of religion or duty to their parents or to the State, and almost all of them have for-

[1] Mr. R. Maconachie, I.C.S., "The Desirability of a Definite Recognition of the Religious Element in Government Education in India," *The Asiatic Quarterly*, October 1900. Of course, these opinions are strongly combated by others. See, for instance, the discussion at the East India Association reported in the same review (pp. 395–404). There Mr. N. B. Wagle (a Hindu) declared that "he was at a loss to understand how English education would destroy Hinduism as alleged by Mr. Maconachie. He maintained that English education, instead of destroying Hinduism, purifies it."

[2] Quoted by Dr. Duncan in *The Asiatic Quarterly*, January 1902.

[3] *The Real India* (1908), p. 333.

saken the religion of their forefathers. Indeed, the atmosphere in which they are brought up is an inevitable solvent of their own religious, social, and economic system, which is destroyed while nothing replaces it." Sir A. Wilson says (1892):[1] "It is absolutely true that, so far as the spiritual and moral side of the young man's character is concerned, English education is absolutely and solely negative and destructive. . . . Although we may be training up from year to year batches of young men, intellectually better furnished than their fathers were; and though we may be turning them out better fitted in some respects to fight in the struggle for physical existence, we are turning them out morally poorer than they ever were before." Similarly an Indian, Mr. Bishan Narayan Dar (1896):[2] "The old religion is dying; the old morality is dying; the bonds of custom and tradition which are the bones and sinews of the social organism are dissolving; there is death and decomposition all around. For all this the secular spirit of the educational system is responsible."[3]

"To-day," says Bishop Mylne,[4] "there are

[1] Quoted by the Rev. G. Longridge, *History of the Oxford Mission to Calcutta* (1900), p. 115.

[2] Quoted *ibid.*, p. 119.

[3] Cf. also the quotation pp. 108, 109, *supra.*

[4] *Missions to Hindus*, 1908, p. 141. Cf. also the quotations given on pp. 121–124 *infra.*

Government Universities in all the Presidency cities, and in other centres as well; while over the whole of India there are colleges and schools innumerable, in which all Western culture is brought within the reach of the people. Nor is this Western culture cast always, or even generally, in any Christian mould. The English professors may be Christians; they may be absolutely indifferent; they may teach dogmatic atheism. Christian teaching with proselytizing intent our Government, it is true, could not give. If it did it would be false to its pledges, and would be in danger of raising a rebellion. But the result of this secular system is an utter uprooting and disturbing of the students' religious convictions, while nothing is substituted for them. It is the constant complaint of fathers that their sons lose all belief in the religious systems of their ancestors, and are offered no other to replace them."[1]

[1] Cf. the following account of the effects of Western education in Egypt:—"The truth is that, in passing through the European educational mill, the young Egyptian Moslem loses his Islamism, or, at all events, he loses the best part of it. He cuts himself adrift from the sheet-anchor of his creed. He no longer believes that he is always in the presence of his Creator, to whom he will some day have to render an account of his actions. . . . Moreover, in losing his Islamism, the educated Egyptian very rarely makes any approach towards Christianity. . . . It is doubtful whether the price which is being paid, or which, at all events, may have to be paid for introducing European civilization into these backward Eastern societies, is always recognized so

§ 39. If the Hindu system of morality — the morality of caste — be no better than Bishop Mylne has elsewhere described it,[1] the action of secular education in destroying it need not be greatly deplored. How far the institution of a large number of rival colleges, staffed exclusively by missionary teachers, would bring about a different set of consequences is open to question. Here, for instance, is a statement, by a Burmese adherent of Buddhism, of the consequences of the spread of Western education in Burma in undermining the respect of the young for the national religion and its high ethical teaching. The blame, however, it should be noted, is laid rather on the religious than on the secular schools. "Western education is obtained in Government and in missionary schools, and it follows that parents who can afford the expense send their children to those schools. As missionary schools are more numerous than Government schools, the number of children attend-

fully as it should be. The material benefits derived from Europeanization are unquestionably great, but as regards the ultimate effect on public and private morality the future is altogether uncertain. European civilization destroys one religion without substituting another in its place. It remains to be seen whether the code of Christian morality, on which European civilization is based, can be dissociated from the teaching of the Christian religion. This question can only be answered by generations which are now unborn. For the present, there is little to guide us in any forecast as to what the ultimate result will be" (Lord Cromer's *Modern Egypt*, 1908, Vol. II, pp. 230, 231).

[1] *Ibid.*, chapters v.–vii. See quotations pp. 43, 44, *supra*.

ing denominational schools is great. Government schools, at least, are neutral, and if our sons are not taught Buddhism there, they are also not taught any other form of religion. With the missionary schools the case is vastly different; there, our sons and daughters are taught the Christian religion whether they like it or not. In fact, it is part of their curriculum; they have to read Christian books; they have to study the Bible. Worse, they are made to believe that the religion of their parents is all wrong, good for nothing, sinful! The unavoidable result is that some are converted to Christianity, which they never well grasp, and never properly practise; others imbibe a kind of contempt, not seldom unknown to themselves, for Buddhism; they feel a repugnance to perform their duties and to go to monasteries; they have no longer any respect for their clergy. The reason of it all is that they have not, from the beginning of their studies, masters who are Buddhists. It will easily be understood that when such boys come to the estate of man they will not take any interest in the welfare of their religion; nay, they will laugh at the idea; some are already doing so. Is not this the beginning of the downfall? All parents have remarked how different are the majority of our children from their fathers and mothers; they seem to have forgotten the beautiful tradition of

love and respect handed down to us from time immemorial; respect to the aged, to their parents, to their teachers. The little learning they have seems to turn their heads altogether; they become fops, act foppishly, and, what is worse, forget to respect those to whom respect is due. All are not yet like this; we speak of the majority. This change is rightly attributed to the education received in the Government and, above all, in the missionary schools."[1]

§ 40. We need not lay too much stress on this contrast between present-day absence of love and reverence, and the state of things that existed in the golden days of the last generation. Our own parents have in most cases told us the same tale about ourselves. But two distinct questions are raised by these passages: Firstly, do the admittedly secularizing effects follow on the teaching of missionary as well as of Governmental schools?

[1] Translated from a native pamphlet for the *Rangoon Gazette*, and quoted in *Indian Education* (Bombay), July 1907. It may be of interest to quote the report of the Director of Public Instruction for Burma: "If the officers and persons who admire the ancient methods of the *Pongyis* were to be left dependent upon them for the supply of subordinates, they would rapidly arrive at a better appreciation of their practical value. What is worth retaining in the monastic system is the respect for authority, the moral influence of grave and reverend monks who have forsworn the pomps and vanities of the world, and the intellectual culture consciously or unconsciously produced by the study of a dignified classical language, which is, moreover, the vehicle of the people's religious aspirations. But for practical life a more concrete, regular, and definite education is essential" (*Quinquennial Review*, 1902–7).

and, secondly, are these secularizing effects, for minds such as the Indian, predominantly good or evil? In discussing the latter question, we must bear in mind the habitual Oriental divorce of ethics from religion; and also the Hindu confusion of caste regulations with morality.

Mr. R. P. Paranjpye, Principal of Fergusson College, Poona, writes as follows: "It is my deliberate opinion that the secularization of education in India is one of the wisest steps taken by Government, and it is this which is leading onwards with ever-increasing speed to the creation of a nationality in India. There are defects —some of them grave defects—in the system. But secularization is certainly not one of them.

"Curious are some of the grounds on which the writer of the article condemns the present system. One of them is, for instance, the fact that Indians are gradually drifting from a dogmatic belief in their ancient religions. A good case may be made even against this alleged fact. One need only mention the ground that is being gained by new religious sects, like the Brahmos, the Arya Samajists, the Theosophists, etc. These all point to a closer examination of ancient religious beliefs in the light of modern knowledge and philosophy.[1] If crude superstitious practices

[1] "Christianity," writes Mr. J. Kennedy ("The Tendencies of Modern Hinduism," *The East and the West*, April 1905), "has

are no longer blindly followed, can we call this a great loss to the people in general? It may, of course, be very uncomfortable for sentimentalists, who delight in anything that is only sufficiently old, to see that such material for the indulgence of their sentimentalism is gradually being lost. It may be rather hard to the official who found it much easier to rule over people accustomed to unquestioning obedience, to have to do with men who can reason. If there is at all a spirit of militant Hinduism abroad, it is one which claims for philosophic Hinduism its proper place among the serious solutions of the

penetrated much more deeply among the educated than among the masses, although among the masses Christianity works conversion, and only reformation among the *élite*." . . . "Religion is a matter of perennial interest in India, and there is a class which finds it vitally important to reconcile Western science, if not Western religion, with its own traditions. The declared adherents of the new schools of thought are not very numerous—they do not probably number one-tenth of the class in question—but at least an equal number are seriously engaged on the same problem." Comparing twentieth-century India with the Roman Empire of the first two centuries, the same writer says (*The East and the West*, October 1904): "In India we have a similar revival of the religious spirit, a similar predominance of individual belief, the exaltation of a Hindu nationality which has a religious philosophy for its root, a rejuvenated philosophy which attempts to be both universal and antique. New moral ideas are taking shape, and the masses are becoming respectable, if the gods are hard to moralize. . . . It is popularly supposed that our rule in India makes entirely for scepticism and materialism, although this is contradicted by the whole trend of Indian thought and literature. I shall have accomplished my purpose in this essay if I have shown that English rule makes for a revival of the religious spirit."

great problems of the world, and is not content with having its beliefs classed among the curious data fit only for theories on aboriginal beliefs. Far from the absence of any struggle in giving up cherished beliefs, we know several who have passed through serious intellectual trouble before they gave up their old beliefs in favour of agnosticism, and some who, not being satisfied with the negative creed of agnostics, have reverted to Vedantism and other philosophic systems. Compared with the number of Indians who can easily read something better and more serious than current fiction, we believe that the circulation in India of the works of Tyndall, Huxley, Spencer, Mill, Morley, Clifford,[1] and others will come out to the credit of educated Indians. Even supposing that educated Indians do drift

[1] The selection of authors should be noted. To the educated Indian these, with a few other names, represent English literature. How different would have been the "secularizing" effect if the representative names had been, say, Ruskin, Emerson, Thoreau, Carlyle, Seeley, Sidgwick, and G. Lowes Dickinson (to take a somewhat haphazard group of non-orthodox writers). It is curious how the influence of the Spencer-Mill group has seemingly reached its highest point in India a generation after educated Englishmen have ceased to pay attention to them, and at a time when their prestige is already waning among our own artisan classes. (A survival of certain confused ideas of man's relation to the State, which have come down from Herbert Spencer, will account also for many of the eccentricities of the present "friends of India" in the House of Commons, without the necessity of imputing to them either unscrupulous popularity-mongering or a malicious love of mischief-making, as motives for their erratic activities.)

away from religion and grow indifferent about it, can anyone regard the subjects that have taken its place in their minds as any the less important? Other matters, says the article, such as politics, or social reform, or the progress of their community, assume greater importance in their eyes. The greater the importance these subjects get, the better, say I. There is arising among all educated people a greater desire to see some correspondence between words and deeds, and even militant Hindus are constrained to use halting language in depreciation of social reform, knowing full well that social reform is bound to come from the spirit of the times. All that they can say is that political reform should precede social reform. It is due to absence of religious education in its dogmatic form—without which form, I believe, religious education is bound to be altogether a failure, even in the opinion of its staunchest advocates—that such reforms as sea-voyages, widow-marriages, widows' homes, are meeting with sympathy even from orthodox people."[1]

§ 41. We have to realize, then, that such education in India as is nominally connected with religion (other than Christian) is in most cases, owing largely to the character of the religions of India, practically non-ethical. Christian

[1] *Indian Education* (Bombay), March 1907.

teaching with its distinctively ethical character has awakened the minds of Indians to this cardinal truth, and we find men calling out for some form of teaching (usually conceived as religious) which will embody an ethical training. Quite commonly it is the educational policy of the Government that is blamed for the break-up of the restraining ideals by which the youth of India was previously influenced; and the thoughts of reformers run back to an imaginary golden age, before the days of secularizing universities, when a noble system of morals was faithfully observed by the predecessors of those whom we are turning into immoral atheists. But whatever the ultimate cause, the demand for religious instruction is widespread. Thus Sir W. W. Hunter writes: "I found from taking the evidence of 193 witnesses throughout India, as President of the Education Commission, that these leaders were unanimous in lamenting the absence of religious teaching in our State schools, in every province of the Indian Empire."[1] "To-day" (says Mr. A. G. Fraser[2]) "parents feel that character is lost sight of in the curriculum, and they must

[1] Quoted, *The East and the West*, January 1908, p. 31. The reader, however, should note the suggested explanation of this native demand for religious education put forward in the footnote to p. 76 *supra*.

[2] "Education in India and Ceylon," *The East and the West*, January 1908.

choose for their sons either the material prosperity and position which may follow in the train of a Western education with its accompanying atheism, materialism, and denationalization, or remaining Indian choose ignorance and idleness, for the ancient schools are almost gone."

§ 42. What we have first to ask then is, whether this lively sense of the ethical deficiencies of the present system is due to a real falling away from nobler things, or whether it is owing to the contact with Western ideals (not clad necessarily in a Christian garb, but certainly informed by the Christian spirit) that the conscience of the better among the Indians has been so awakened that they have at last become aware of grave shortcomings which have never been absent in Indian social life, and more especially in the Oriental training of the young.

In favour of the former view may be quoted, in addition to the remarks of Sir W. W. Hunter and Mr. Fraser (just cited), and the passages given on pp. 110–113 *supra*, the following paragraphs, which lay stress on deficiencies of the present system believed to be absent from the earlier.

"The traditional idea of Education in India is based on reverence for the teacher, whose word was law, and who was almost worshipped by his *chelas* (pupils). If the pupils did not live together

—as they actually did in the case of the Sanskrit *tols*—they lived in such contiguity to the *guru* (teacher) in their own villages that they were always under his personal supervision, and probably also resided with their parents or guardians. Since the great development of the Education Department, this principle of personal supervision, which produced such reverence for the teacher, has been abandoned or treated as unimportant. The numbers attending the schools and colleges have increased so enormously that personal supervision, though more necessary than before, has become almost impossible.[1]

"In varying degrees in the different educational centres the Indian pupil is treated as if he was an Englishman, in that his own environment is largely ignored, and all that is truly Oriental in his life left uninterpreted and undeveloped. And when religion and all his old traditions and history are neglected in his curriculum, the pupil not unnaturally receives the impression that they are unimportant and despised. Thus students are freed from the religious and social restraints of old India, and, in Sir William Hunter's words, are left 'without discipline, without contentment, and without God.'"[2]

[1] Mr. S. M. Mitra, *Indian Problems*, 1908, p. 26.

[2] Mr. A. G. Fraser, "Education in India and Ceylon," *The East and the West*, January 1908. The President of the Provincial Conference annually held in Madras is reported as urging

"Our Indian education is creating an immense class for whom it has largely loosened the authority and obligation of the past, and who with quickened intellectual capacities crave for a career which we cannot afford to open, for lack of that moral fibre which we have failed to supply them, in the place of what they have lost. Such a situation is charged with peril; and it cannot possibly stop there. We must go on to furnish those moral and spiritual forces which alone can supplement and justify our education."[1]

§ 43. In favour of the contrasted view, which ascribes the widely felt dissatisfaction with the moral shortcomings of the present system to the awakening of a previously dormant social conscience in response to the unobtrusive moral element in this very system itself (acting in conjunction with other Western influences), we may refer the reader to such dicta as that of Mr. Rau

the need for a reformed system of education for boys and girls on national lines not in opposition to, but distinct from, the English system. "They were deeply grateful to Government for what they have done in the cause of education. Western thought and Western civilization have conferred on them the great blessing that their eyes have been opened, and they can see what is needed to inaugurate a system of education which will build up the national life. In such a system the English language would not have a predominant place. In any system of national education religious and moral training must find a proper place, for 'education without a religious basis is like building a house without foundations'" (*The Edinburgh Review*, October 1907, p. 285).

[1] Rev. T. E. Slater (quoted by Mr. A. G. Fraser).

(quoted, pp. 55, 56, *supra*). The following passages give the same general impression :—

"The necessity of co-operation, larger toleration, and larger sympathy has already dawned upon the Muslims, and with their newly awakened consciences it is but natural that new visions should float before them and new ambitions should stir them to activity. . . . [Sir Syed Ahmed Khan (founder of Aligarh College)] laid greater emphasis on the ethical teaching of Islam than on the dogmatic. He brushed aside the cobwebs of dogma and superstition, and brought into prominence those maxims and teachings of the Prophet which will be received, accepted, and cherished to the end of time."[1]

"The younger generation of Mahommedans . . . seem to realize the value of co-operation in the prosecution of national objects. Western education has broadened their vision and widened their horizon. With a clearer insight into the needs and requirements of their people they are less inclined to take an optimistic view and stand still."[2]

"Home education, which is the foundation of all education in maturer years, is, as a rule, entirely

[1] Mr. S. Khuda Bukhsh, "The Nineteenth Century and the Musulmans of India," *The Asiatic Quarterly*, April 1901.

[2] Mr. Ameer Ali, "Indian Race Characteristics," *The Nineteenth Century*, November 1907.

absent in India, and this is so for two reasons: (1) child marriages and early maternity; (2) absence of female education. . . . The mothers, being, as a rule, uneducated, cannot impart any moral or social training to their children. . . . Nurseries, nursery governesses, and nursery education are practically unknown even among the richer classes."[1]

§ 44. Official utterances are usually (and naturally) couched in an optimistic vein. Occasionally, however, we find less complaisant expressions of opinion in the Governmental communications and reports.

Thus, from the report on secondary education in the United Provinces: "The complaint is often made that the education given in our schools leaves a good deal to be desired on the moral side; and thoughtful and observant men express uneasiness at the decay of good manners and the deterioration of conduct."[2]

Similarly from Madras: "A more serious matter is the neglect of attempt at character-building as a part of the school education. Opportunities for this are not, of course, so plentiful as in England, where so many secondary schools are boarding schools, but it is

[1] "Indian Economic Questions: Education," by a Native of India, *The Asiatic Quarterly*, April 1903.

[2] *Quinquennial Review*, 1902–7, p. 81.

feared that little advantage is taken of such as do exist."[1]

And from the Central Provinces: "It appears, then, that the success of all the existing aids to discipline and moral training is very incomplete. Nor can much be expected from the study of moral text-books of the type of *Æsop's Fables*, or even from biographies.[2] There is always wanting the

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 81.

[2] The difficulty of conveying unobtrusive but effective moral teaching by way of biographies of great men seems almost insuperable in India. Lives of Western heroes are quite unsuitable, postulating as they do the absence of caste, and assuming consequently opportunities of rising by self-help and achieving great things in defiance of a hostile environment. The social atmosphere is too alien to make the tales of any personal value. The same, however, does not apply to New Testament biographies. These ought to appeal with more force to the Indian than to the English schoolboy.

As bearing on the difficulties due to the different social environments of teachers and taught, the following remarks are worth consideration:—"But, individually, this new education has produced another sad moral result. It has given birth to a *certain unreality of character and unhealthiness of moral sentiment.* It has filled the minds of its recipients with high ethical principles and broad liberal rules of social life, to which their daily habits and ways of life furnish no counterpart. They are chained to traditional usages which they cannot break through without serious personal injury to themselves. Hence it happens that they propound, on the platform or in newspaper articles, high moral and social ideas which they fail to live by in the domestic and social circles. . . . Thus it is a life of unreality which many of them are forced to live. It is my solemn conviction that this mode of sop-throwing to the wounded conscience may temporarily disguise a man's weakness from other eyes, but it inevitably fails in the end to give peace to the soul or lift the man to the dignity of manhood" (Mr. Siva Nath Sastri, "English Education in Bengal," *East and West*, Bombay, March 1902).

inspiring influence of a definite spirit. I firmly believe that so long as our teaching of morality and discipline in Indian schools has no basis in religion, we may go on talking about school discipline, but we shall never have it."[1]

§ 45. The more usual official view is represented by the following passages. We begin with the report of the Education Commission of 1882 (President, Sir W. W. Hunter):—

"Of the morality of our ex-students question has sometimes been made; not so much because experience justified an accusation, as because it was presupposed that those who received no definite religious instruction must necessarily have but little reverence for a moral law to which were attached no divine sanctions. There is, however, no reason whatever why a scientific education should lower the standard of conduct. It is true that such education tends to weaken and destroy primitive beliefs, and a young man's studies at college are certainly not calculated to weaken his appreciation of moral truths. . . . If, again, under the term morality we include those qualities which tend to the general welfare of a people, then in a larger sense has the highly educated native vindicated his claim to our respect. For it is he whose enterprise and enthu-

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 82.

siasm has done much to rouse self-effort in education, and whose munificence has not seldom made that possible. It is he who has created the native press in its most intelligent form. His are the various societies, literary and scientific, societies for religious and for social reform. To his activity it is due that vernacular literature is so rapidly multiplying its utility. From his number have come men who have guided the policy of Native States at critical times, and filled with dignity important offices under the British Government. Still, desirous as we are fully to acknowledge the good effects of collegiate education, we do not shut our eyes to certain deficiencies of result and certain positive evils ascribed to various defects of system. We cannot affirm that in education has been found a sufficient cure for the comparative absence of lofty motive and of a sense of public duty which for long centuries has been an admitted drawback on so much that is attractive in the character of the natives of India. We cannot deny that though the standard of morality is higher than it was, it is still a morality based to a large extent upon considerations of a prudential self-interest rather than upon any higher principles of action. . . . On the other hand, however, it must not be forgotten that improvements in this matter, especially under the conditions imposed by the past history of the

country, must be the work of several generations. . . . Again, those who most fully recognize the general improvement, ascribe it to influences of which education is but one, and by no means the most prominent one; though to this it may perhaps be replied that it is education which has brought about a state of mind upon which alone those other influences could work. . . . Nor, again, is there reason to believe that collegiate education of the present type has any injurious effect upon the life and character of the students. On the contrary, the nearly unanimous testimony of those who have had the best opportunities of observing goes to show that in integrity, in self-respect, in stability of purpose, and generally in those solid qualities which constitute an honourable and useful character, the University graduate is generally superior to those who have not enjoyed the advantages which college training confers."

Alongside this we may place the following from Lord Curzon's Calcutta University Convocation Address, 1899:—

"I then proceed to ask the able officials by whom I am surrounded, and whose trained assistance makes the labour of a Viceroy of India a relaxation rather than a toil, whether they have observed any reflection of this beneficent influence

in the quality and character of the young men who enter into the ranks of what is now known as the Provincial Service. And when I hear from them almost without dissent that there has been a marked upward trend in the honesty, in the integrity and capacity of the native officials in those departments of Government, then I decline altogether to dissociate cause and effect; I say that knowledge has not been altogether shamed by her children."

Mr. Giles (Director of Public Instruction in Bombay) before the Universities Commission, 1902:—

"Finally, I wish to place on record my opinion that . . . the University has done and is doing valuable work, and is producing men who are not only occasionally brilliant scholars, but who are, on the whole, fairly well-educated, well-mannered, and well-conducted. My experience after twenty-nine years is that our graduates are generally men who are fit to be public servants, and to take their place in the various walks of life, that the tendency in the colleges and in the students is towards improvement, and that the University of Bombay is not behind any other University in India either in the efficiency of its management or in the sufficiency of its results."

The following is from a Resolution of the Government of India, 1904:—

"It is almost universally admitted that substantial benefits have been conferred upon the people themselves by the advance which has been made in Indian education within the last fifty years; . . . and that there has been a marked improvement in the character of the public servants now chosen from the ranks of educated natives, as compared with those of the days before schools and Universities had commenced to exercise their elevating influence."

From the Memorandum (1909) on the Results of Indian Administration during the past fifty years:—[1]

"Another important factor in this improvement [in the administration of justice] has been the advance made by the great majority of Indian Judges and Magistrates in education, in legal training, and in uprightness of character. Nine-tenths of the original civil suits, and more than three-quarters of the magisterial business of the country, come before Indian Judges and Magistrates. Fifty years ago few of these officers knew English, none of them had obtained a University degree, and hardly any had enjoyed any legal training. At the present time Civil Judges know

[1] [Cd. 4956]

English as a matter of course, and many are University graduates in arts or law, while in most provinces all salaried magistrates appointed in recent years are men of education. . . . With the improvement in education and salary has come a much higher standard of probity and sense of duty. In old days public officers of this class were often accused or suspected of corrupt motives. At the present time such accusations against these officers are rare.

"Not only has there been great improvement in character and attainments in these branches of the public service, but a large number of Indian gentlemen in most provinces have evinced their fitness for employment as honorary magistrates. Fifty years ago an honorary magistrate here or there discharged a little judicial business; last year there were more than 3000 honorary magistrates, who deal with a great quantity of petty magisterial business in towns and rural tracts; their decisions give satisfaction in the main; their procedure is fairly correct, and many of them take real interest in their public duties."

§ 46. With these official paragraphs we may set the following :—

"I speak from positive personal experience when I aver generally, that an educated native, when he has had some practical training, makes a

far more useful and far more trustworthy official than a man of the old school."[1]

"Whatever be the source of the new morality in India, its presence and its progress are not to be denied. It does not as yet touch the people as a whole, but it illumines even now the highest intellects and consciences among them."[2]

"One feature is apparent in educated India to-day. There is *life* where before was stagnation. The spiritual nature of Indian thinkers and writers is absorbed in the prospect of an awakening East, an Indian Nation, a free and enlightened People, a deliverance from the nightmare of superstition and the tyranny of caste. . . . Before that time, a note of helplessness and despair ran through the thoughts and writings even of those who were the most persistent workers for the good of the country. But now educated India is tingling with new life. The form taken may be at times extremely crude and even repellent, but it is life, life, life!"[3]

"Sir Auckland Colvin, afterwards Lieutenant-Governor of the N.W. Provinces, wrote to the *Pioneer* in 1884 . . . urging that there was as much difference between the India of Ellenborough (1840) and the India of Ripon as there

[1] Raja Sir T. Madava Row, *Political Opinions*, Madras, 1890, p. 5.

[2] Bishop Welldon of Calcutta, quoted by Dr. Duncan, *The Asiatic Quarterly*, January 1902.

[3] The Rev. C. F. Andrews, *North India* (1908), p. 192.

was between the London of Queen Anne and the London of Victoria. He further expressed his opinion thus: 'While the English mind in India has been tempted to stand still, arrested by the contemplation of the fruits of its efforts in former times . . . the Indian mind has been marching on eager and anxious to expand its own sphere of action, and to do what it, for its own part, has to do. Rapidly maturing under the influence of great facilities for communication, stimulated by more frequent contact with England, and encouraged by opportunities afforded during successive years of profound peace, it has succeeded in awaking to the consciousness of its own powers and the assurance of its own success. The breath has come into the bones, and they are about to live and stand upon their feet.'"[1]

"The last nine years of my life in India have been spent in the manufacture of the B.A. . . . . My estimate of his importance in the scheme of creation may differ from his own (a view which I have never thought it necessary to conceal from him), but that he is in almost all important respects greatly superior to the majority of the generation whom he succeeds, cannot be seriously denied by anyone familiar with native society. He comes a long way short of an ideal standard, no doubt; but what reasonableness was there in

[1] *Indian Review*, December 1904, p. 861.

ever measuring him by such a standard? It is a legitimate and sufficient ground for congratulation that he possesses a much greater sense of public duty than his parents; that in the administration of justice for which they usually took bribes, his hands are clean; and that upon him depend the reforms in religious belief and social usage which are troubling the hitherto still waters of Indian society. These are solid merits which it is ungenerous not to recognize because our fastidious taste kecks at some crudeness in his manners, and the licentiousness of his political oratory."[1]

"It is something to be able to say of the generation brought up under the English system that if not in an intellectual, at any rate in a moral sense, it favourably distinguishes itself from its predecessors. It is this moral side of the character of the Neo-Hindu which promises so much."[2]

§ 47. But these expressions of opinion, official and unofficial alike, are necessarily the conclusions of very partial information, and often of information that has passed through very biassed channels.

"The men who are really competent to speak with any authority on the subject are just a hand-

[1] Sir Theodore Morison, *Imperial Rule in India* (1899), p. 113.

[2] Professor Vambéry, *Western Culture in Eastern Lands* (1906), p. 203.

ful, but every anonymous scribbler must needs have his fling at the poor Indian graduate. . . . The fact is, the majority of critics, who write and speak about University education and its effects, merely echo the sentiments which they obtain at second hand from a few who, probably with the desire to see certain existing defects remedied, lay undue emphasis on them; and this exaggerated view is echoed and re-echoed throughout the country by the unthinking multitude. Take the criticisms of the Press, Indian and Anglo-Indian; it is the same stereotyped remarks that we notice everywhere."[1]

§ 48. As regards the contrasted effects of missionary school teaching and secular education we may quote the following:—"I do not propose to dwell at length on the thesis that there can be no education of morals in the truest sense without religion. It is a narrower but sufficiently wide proposition to state that as a fact, under the Government system of education, no appreciable rise in morality can be observed. Undoubtedly—and we cannot be too thankful for this—undoubtedly the system of education pursued in mission schools has had a far-reaching effect on the state of popular morality even among those who have not openly professed themselves Christians. But

[1] Dr. S. Satthianadan, "University Education in India," *Indian Review*, Madras, March 1902.

this only throws into darker relief the evil wrought by the Government schools—the success indeed of the one is as marked as the failure of the other. Statistics on such a point are not to be had, but I think it right to give my personal testimony that whenever I met any young man in India who seemed above his fellows in morality, inquiry always, as far as I can remember, elicited the fact that he had either been at a mission school or had come in some way under the personal influence, if not the teaching, of a missionary. I do not wish to impose my experience on anyone; it may be taken for what it is worth."[1]

Similarly: "P. C. Mozoomdar, of the Brahmo Somaj, declared in a public speech, under the chairmanship of a pronounced anti-Christian civilian, that he knew the students of Mission Colleges by their having more backbone and moral principle, and by their being more of men than others. Sir Andrew Fraser, K.C.S.I., LL.D., Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal, states: 'It has been my policy to find out the school from which boys who are candidates for Government service come, and I find that the best boys have come from missionary schools and colleges.'"[2]

§ 49. Such sharp judgments on the issue are

[1] Mr. R. Maconachie, in *The Asiatic Quarterly*, October 1900.
[2] Mr. A. G. Fraser, *Education in India and Ceylon*, 1908, p. 26.

not common. And, moreover, not only is it extremely difficult with rival systems of education (missionary, indigenous, and secular) to separate out—as Sir A. Fraser and Mr. Maconachie believe they can do—the effects of the one and of the other; we have also to bear in mind the presence of many other interacting forces than the purely educational.

First and foremost we must place the vernacular Press, at once the offspring of the new educational system and its rival, in whose outpourings "are mingled both the cause and the effect of much of the unrest prevalent among the educated classes in India."[1] To this we have made reference elsewhere (pp. 97–99 *supra*).

Another perhaps equally cogent influence which should not be forgotten is the observed behaviour of the scattered representatives of Western civilization. This influence is not all for the good. "They observe us from without," writes a former Bishop of Bombay,[2] "and they see, as outsiders, what our manner of life in their country is. It is not a disciplined life, there is far too keen an appetite for excitement and amusements in various forms—many of our ladies in particular

[1] "Signs of the Times in India," *Edinburgh Review*, October 1907, p. 276.

[2] The Bishop of Southampton, in *The East and the West*, January 1908. Cf. Dr. Josiah Oldfield's article, "The Failure of Indian Missions," in *The Hibbert Journal*, April 1903.

seem to live for little else. . . . The perpetual round of gaiety, the daily visits to the gymkhana occupying the whole afternoon, the games, the organized pleasures, the dinners, the dances, combined with the habits of aloofness from the natives, the peremptory manner, the habitual hauteur, give an impression of superficiality, of selfishness, of pure worldliness and materialism, which is an offence of the gravest kind to the best thought and consciousness of India, which is most damaging to our influence."

And if we turn to the lower strata of the English population in India, we find the same charges made. "On the whole," says Mr. J. Kennedy,[1] "the direct action of Christianity upon popular Hinduism is very slight, a fact not so strange if we remember that the British soldier is the chief interpreter of Christianity to the masses." "The British Army," says an experienced American missionary,[2] "is certainly the greatest trial to the Indian, and brutally rides roughshod over all his sensibilities. If 'Tommy Atkins' could only be left at home, with safety to British interest in this land, it would help largely to improve the situation between the two races. It would also save England from the terrible disgrace of immorality which the army is instrumental in carrying as a plague wherever it goes."

[1] *The East and the West*, April 1905.
[2] Dr. J. P. Jones, *North American Review*, April 1899.

Even against those Anglo-Indians whose private lives are admirable, the charge is often brought that they excite native resentment by the claim of racial superiority implied in their social exclusiveness. From this charge, however, H.H. the Aga Khan vigorously defends us. "In India," he points out,[1] "people are still living in compartments; there is less social intercourse between Mohamedan and Hindu or between Rajput and Parsi than between any of these races and the English in India. If there is aloofness, it is much more due to the Indian not unnaturally preferring his own section of the community to the others. As to the Indians who complain about not having enough intercourse with Englishmen, they are generally men who (probably for the most honourable reasons, such as breaking some caste rules) are not readily received by their own people, and thus wish to know the English, who, not being conversant with Indian customs, are shy to mix with them. Yet, even as things are, Englishmen, and Englishmen alone, receive and have friends among all classes and races."

§ 50. When we realize the co-existence of all these rival influences, reinforcing or counteracting one another, it is hardly possible for us to dogmatize on their relative importance. As Mr. R. A.

[1] "Some Thoughts on Indian Discontent," *The National Review*, February 1907.

Bray, dealing with an allied problem[1] nearer home, puts it: "In these days of Elementary, Higher Elementary, and Secondary Schools; in these times of Continuation Classes, Technical Institutes, and Colleges of Science; in this epoch of physical, mental, and moral training; in this age of denominationalism, undenominationalism, and secularism, of the religion of Cowper-Temple and the religion of the Churches; in short, in this twentieth century era of educational machinery, we are apt to think that were all this elaborate appliance swept away, man's body would be left unformed, his faculties undeveloped, and his character undisciplined. But this is the fallacy which mistakes his clothes for the person who wears them, or the creeper for the house up which it grows, which neglects the essential and the obvious in its efforts to give weight to the subsidiary and the artificial. We see the finished work of our designing and, in the pride of the creator, forget how small has been our actual achievement. We have ignored the influence of the natural forces, and have failed to note how near completion was the article when first we took it in hand. We add a little here, take away something there, and fancy we call into existence a whole new universe of our own." What is true of the London child must be ten times truer of

[1] *The Town Child*, p. 8.

the Indian youth, for whom only the outer fringes of his life can be touched by our Western education and the Western influences consciously and deliberately brought to bear on him. Yet it is natural for those who are brought much into contact with one or other of the forces at work to ascribe to it unhesitatingly a predominating influence, especially if it happens (as may well be the case) to be of more than usual importance in the districts which they themselves know best.[1]

For our own part we prefer to leave the riddle unsolved, and turn instead to investigate the moral significance of some of the outstanding effects which may be put down as the results of this whole complexus of causes.

[1] Cf. Mr. Theodore Beck's criticism of Sir Henry Cotton's book. "If the book had been called *New Calcutta* instead of *New India*, and had restricted itself to describing that section of the population which the author apparently knows best, it might have been pronounced a valuable contribution towards our knowledge of modern India. But as it professes to be a manual of instruction for the British public in matters applying to the whole of India, it cannot be dealt with thus leniently" (*Essays on Indian Topics*, Allahabad, 1888).

CHAPTER V

§ 51. TO the Englishman who approaches such a topic as this at the present juncture of national affairs, the phrase "foster a sense of duty"[1] is certain, at first hearing, to convey a very particular sense. It will suggest to him, inevitably, the relations of subject race to ruling race; the duty of which he will think primarily is bound to be the duty of submission to the laws of the State as now established and to the commands of the magistrates set over the people of India by his fellow-countrymen. He will probably overlook, unless he is exceptionally broad-minded, the important fact that his beneficent fellow-countrymen are to the Indians (even if they admit the beneficence) alien conquerors, whose rule rests on might rather than on right. Even if exceptionally broad-minded he is likely to forget that to the most public-spirited of Indians—those, that is, who are most likely to be possessed of "a sense of duty" in general—the State as

[1] See Preface.

now established in India can only present itself as a transitional arrangement, a political expedient which has done, perhaps, much good in the past, which may, perhaps, do yet more good in the immediate future, but which must in the farther future, if the Indian is ever to come to his own and rise to the full stature of political manhood, be finally superseded by something as different from what the Indian Government now is, as the existing British Constitution is different from the constitution of Norman and Angevin England.

The problem of political duty, the question of the proper limitations to the obligation of submission to the established State, is, even in a unified organic State like England, by no means free from complications. The duty of obedience seems at every turn to be crossed by other lines of duty. These other duties nearly always present themselves with a greater emotional intensity than mere political duties. They concern the welfare of sections of society in whom we are more interested than we are in Society in general; they concern in some special way, perhaps, our own soul's welfare; and therefore they are likely to present themselves as "higher" duties. Being accepted as higher, they will be obeyed in preference to ordinary political duties by those who are conscious of them, while the rest of the

community, feeling them not, or feeling them but slightly in the special instance, protests that larger and more permanent aims are subordinated to sectional interests and transient fancies.

The problem of political duty is always a complicated problem. But when we are concerned with the political duties of conquered races its complications become such that no simple solutions are possible.

The duty of obedience in such cases may be overcome by a higher duty of resistance. As a lover of order and progress, I may, if a member of a subject race, feel it incumbent on me to assist in a thousand minor details the good intentions of those whom Fate or Providence has set over me. But it may well seem equally my proper part in life to foster a nascent political consciousness, to stir in sluggish minds not merely a sense of indignation at injustice, but also a consciousness of undeveloped powers which only treachery to one's higher nature can allow to atrophy. And if I play such a part as this (a "double" part it will be certain to seem to the unsympathetic imperialists set over me—rulers who praise my loyalty in administrative matters but are ready to revile me as a sedition-monger at the first glimpse they catch of my larger activities), then, when it seems to me that the appropriate moment has come, I must endeavour to turn my nationalist

teaching into an affair not of words, but of deeds, and strike for what has ever been, in both my "parts," my ultimate aim—the higher welfare of my fellow-subjects.

The unsympathetic member of the ruling race, even though beneficently minded, is bound to demand that the present relationship of race to race must be accepted for at least a considerable period as unalterable in its essentials. The rulers are the superior race ; the ruled are inferior. It therefore seems to him indubitably just that the former should watch over the latter and guide them into higher ways for the good of both, and that the subject peoples should be duly grateful and continuously "loyal."[1] He forgets that it may be possible to admit the relative superiority and be grateful, even, for the beneficence of the conqueror, and yet reject the conclusion that the higher should autocratically govern the lower or the lower submit with unquestioning "loyalty" to their betters. Is it not possible to hold that it

[1] An administrator like Sir E. C. Cox naïvely expresses his amazement (see *The Nineteenth Century*, December 1908) that ex-civilians who show favour to inconvenient political aspirations should be allowed to retain their pensions, quite forgetting that the pensions, though awarded under the regulations of the bureaucracy, are all derived from the purses of the Indian taxpayers, and that the duty of the pensioner is surely to consult the ultimate interests of those on whose bounty he lives, rather than the interests of his former fellow-officials. (A view similar to Sir E. C. Cox's is put forward in *The Quarterly Review* for July 1908, "The Unrest in India.")

is better for a people to misgovern itself (within certain limits) than to be well governed by others? If I mismanage my own affairs I may suffer, economically or in other ways; but if I give over to another the management of what seems to myself the most essential elements of a full life, I am submitting to something much more serious than pecuniary loss or economic ineffectiveness or discomfort. Life is more than bread; and political institutions exist for other objects besides the supplying of a good postal system, a good fiscal system, or even a good system of justice and police.

What then is commonly called "sedition" is not necessarily incompatible with a high sense of social and political duty. It may, no doubt, at a particular juncture, be adjudged incompatible with political sagacity; the shapes which it is taking in contemporary India may be declared proofs of unpreparedness for a full use of political functions. But these are questions of fact. They are not self-evident propositions that can dispense with the support of arguments based on empirical considerations.

We cannot therefore put forward the existing unrest and "disloyalty" of Indians as proof conclusive of the failure of our educational policy to inculcate a sense of political duty. The unrest might even be plausibly cited as proof of the suc-

cess of our instruction.[1] A 'sense of duty' may be evidenced not merely by a patient willingness to

[1] Mr. H. P. Mody, a Parsi, cites in his essay (*The Political Future of India*) the widespread character of the protests against the Partition of Bengal and the Punjab Colonization Bill, as evidence of the awakening of a sense of national solidarity and a consciousness of the duty of subordinating sectional interests to the good of the whole. How far the interest in these special grievances extended is, however, by no means clear. With regard to the Partition of Bengal, Mr. J. D. Rees, C.I.E., M.P., says that "it must be remembered that the rest of India takes no kind of interest in the question and, indeed, is not favourable to Bengali pretensions" (*The Real India*, 1908, p. 206). From Congress speeches I incline, however, to believe that the interest in the "grievance" is fairly widespread, though only, of course, among the educated classes. Compare also the following: "The European official in India, in the interests of the Empire, and in order to win the confidence of the people, should so act as not to show any assumption of a Divine right to rule, or any air of conscious superiority, which, without strengthening his position, jars upon the susceptibilities of the people. I can quite imagine somebody objecting to the view I have expressed, and saying: 'This must be some new sensitiveness that the Indians have developed, as their fathers rejoiced in honouring the rulers.' Yes, it is *new*, but it *is* there, and it has to be taken into account. The Indian to-day is not behind his father in deference to constituted authority, but he is now learning to bow to authority in the abstract as distinguished from its concrete embodiment—the official. He has imbibed the English notions of right and duty, has learnt at the feet of broad-minded English scholars the lessons of independence and love of liberty, and he finds it impossible to behave like those who never had these privileges. It is no use, therefore, to fret at this spirit, which is one of the most direct results of the contact between England and India; but efforts should be made to foster it on right lines, and to encourage it within due bounds" (Shaikh Abdul Qadir, "Young India: its Hopes and Aspirations," *Asiatic Quarterly*, April 1906). "The very contact with Europeans has had an effect on the national character and national ideals. In the absence of legitimate outlets the roused consciousness of latent energies turns into un-

obey, but by a readiness to protest, and a capacity to protest intelligently against the blunders of those in authority.[1]

reasoning discontent" (Mr. Ameer Ali, "Indian Race Characteristics," *Nineteenth Century*, November 1907).

In any case we must remember that it is too late to echo the thought embodied in the phrases of that good royal governor of Virginia who could say, in 1670, "I thank God there are no free schools nor printing, and I hope we shall not have these hundred years. For learning has brought disobedience into the world, and printing has divulged them and libels against the best of Governments: God keep us from both."

[1] It can hardly be necessary to linger over what should by now be a truism—that "unrest" is not by itself a proof of the growth of hardships and poverty. It is usually the populations that are advancing in material welfare that become acutely conscious of advantages which are not yet theirs, rather than the hopelessly downtrodden peoples. (Thus, to take a stock instance, the French peasantry in 1789 were probably much better off than the peasantry of the other parts of the Continent at the same date.) "Feelings of hate and revenge" (says the Aga Khan, *National Review*, February 1907) "will in some hour when they are least expected and most dangerous break out from a materially prosperous but disaffected people. The wealthier such a population is, the more dangerous will it be if it ever rebels."

Nor, further, can we affirm, without great rashness, that the "disloyalty" is the effect either of the mildness or of the sternness of our methods. If all our Indian administrators were Prussian martinets, it may be that the courage to move would always have been wanting. If, on the other hand, they were all sympathetic philanthropists (the phrase, by the way, is not a tautology), it may be that the impulse to revolt would never have been strong enough to cause a movement.

"Sedition is the natural outcome, on one side, of incompatibility of temper between a governed and a governing race, just as repression is upon the other; the two must die out together, either by the complete and final victory of one or other, or by a cessation of the racial hostility from which both spring. Given that it is undesirable either that the national aspirations of India or that

"It is true" (writes John Stuart Mill) "a despot may educate the people; and to do so really, would be the best apology for his despotism. But any education which aims at making human beings other than machines, in the long run makes them claim to have the control of their actions. . . . Even Jesuit education, it seems, was sufficiently real to call forth the appetite for freedom."[1]

§ 52. It may, however, be urged that, whatever the ultimate duty of the subject people in the matter of accepting the control of the sovereign nation, it is a duty of the first importance on the part of every leading thinker among the former to see that he himself is well-informed as regards the motives, aims, methods, and achievements of the latter. This, however, is seldom spontaneously done.

In the case of the average Indian we cannot reasonably expect this task to be undertaken. Indeed, it would by no means be easy for him, handicapped as he is by the paucity of libraries and the comparative expensiveness of books, to acquire the necessary knowledge. Nor do there seem to be

the influence of English civilization in India should be allowed to die, and that these *at present* too often take the shape of sedition on the one hand and repression on the other, we are left with the question, Is the present incompatibility of temper between Englishman and Indian remediable?" (Mr. K. E. Kirk, *Nineteenth Century*, October 1909).

[1] *Representative Government*, chap. III.

any good books on the subject. He is therefore hardly open to serious blame. "It is an absurd mistake," writes Sir Theodore Morison,[1] "to suppose that the Indian student is perversely and obstinately disloyal; he is perfectly capable of understanding correct reasoning and ready to be convinced by it, if the facts and arguments are only put before him; but an appreciation of the excellence of the present administration does not come by nature, and there is no reference to the subject in any of the text-books he has hitherto been taught, which is the only educational agency recognized by Government. Is it then surprising that he holds views which he never hears disputed, and believes facts which he never hears challenged?"[2]

[1] *Imperial Rule in India*, 1899, p. 119.

[2] Cf. also Mr. S. M. Mitra's *Indian Problems*, 1908, p. 30: "To allay the present discontent the rising generation must be taught the benefits of the British rule in India. The present generation has forgotten how India fared under the heels of the Mahratta Cavalry one hundred years ago; they have never troubled themselves to think of the blessings which they enjoy under British rule, and it was gross negligence on the part of British rulers not to tell the modern youth what has been done for their predecessors and for them, and how much they owe to the alien Government whom they denounce so glibly. So far there hardly exist half a dozen works on the subject of the benefits of British rule which might be made text-books in Indian schools and colleges." Cf. Mr. K. K. Chandi's "Education and Citizenship" in the *Madras Christian College Magazine*, March 1908: "Students now appear generally to believe too little, many of them looking on Englishmen as mere despoilers and enemies. If, therefore, an unprejudiced Indian of accepted credibility would explain

"It is not an uncommon thing to hear even educated Indians question the benefit of railways, steamers, and telegraphs, and to represent these as forming part of the diabolical contrivances by which England drains India's wealth and im-

in simple language the great privileges that Indians enjoy under the British Raj, and at the same time point out our great limitations, show us that we are only at the beginning of the race, and define with some clearness the path that has to be followed in the ultimately best interests of India and England, the gain to the State and to citizens would be incalculable. With the exception of Sir W. Lee-Warner's book, which, there is reason to believe, finds no favour with the average student or citizen, I do not know of any book on Indian citizenship, whereas partisan and acrimonious writings appear in abundance, and are devoured with avidity." Sir F. S. P. Lely points out forcibly the same need in the dealings of the administration with the peasantry. The earlier native official "was a man of the people, seldom knowing English, of conservative views, but loyal to his salt, and a friend, though often a bit of a tyrant, to the villagers. I have known such men in time of cholera clean up and disinfect their town in order to satisfy their superiors, but at the same time get sacrificial fires along the streets duly lighted by Brahmins in order to really meet the trouble. . . . They have been replaced by a race of educated intelligence who know English and can therefore understand the Secretariate speech, but are too much of the 'Sahib' to join the village circle. Whereas the former man sat on his cushion among his clerks, *primus inter pares*, the modern must have his chair and his table and, if possible, the solitary state of a separate room. Generally speaking, there is now no one of authority to say what the people think and to explain what Government means. That mission is made over to the *Kal* and the *Kesari* newspapers" (*Suggestions for the Better Governing of India*, 1906, p. 17). Some interesting descriptive paragraphs, showing the influence of the anti-English newspapers that reach the remote, simple, previously loyal villages, will be found in the *Nineteenth Century* for September 1909 ("Spiritual Forces in India," by the Rev. N. Macnicol).

poverishes her people. . . . About the moral and material progress of his country since 1857 the Indian graduate has no real knowledge—no knowledge, that is to say, resting on anything better than hearsay or the reading of half-informed newspapers. And unfortunately, living, as he does in our days, in an atmosphere of suspicion and race prejudice, he easily imbibes the false and pernicious notion that England's work in India has been only to bleed her people and enrich herself at their expense.[1] The young men who pass out of our colleges have never been taught anything about the elements of citizenship; they know nothing about the administration of India, nothing about the stupendous work that has been done and is in progress for the moral and material benefit of its people."[2]

This sort of social knowledge is not likely to be gained unless it is specially incorporated in the educational curricula,[3] or supplied in some such

[1] Cf. Sir T. Morison, *Imperial Rule in India*, 1899, p. 123: "No political opinion is so wide-spread as that India is getting poorer and poorer every year, and this belief is a constant source of ill-will and disaffection; it forms the burden of every complaint against the British rule, and is shared with melancholy conviction by those who take no part in political agitation." Compare also p. 40, *ibid.*

[2] Prof. N. G. Welinkar, "The Problems of Higher Education in India," *Asiatic Quarterly*, April 1908.

[3] It seems that some steps have recently been taken in this direction in the case of the University of Calcutta. There are, however, grave difficulties in the way of making the policy effec-

way as Sir T. Morison suggests.[1] For the people who are interested in spreading views of any sort about the objects of the Government are usually those who desire to see the spread of what we consider false views. These must be combated even by those who look forward eagerly to a self-governing India; and the combating of the false is most satisfactorily achieved if the true be made part of the regular schooling of the educated Indians. To quote Mr. Welinkar again: "In India . . . a system of liberal education has to subserve another peculiar function of fundamental import-

tive. The following, from the *Educational Review*, Madras, 1900, will make this clear: "We have more than once deprecated the action of the Supreme and Local Governments in thrusting Sir William's (Lee-Warner's) or any other text-book of Indian Politics on an unwilling people. Even if the book referred to be prescribed by every Education Department and University in India, nothing will be easier than to defeat the object of the Government. The subject-matter of the book must be explained by the teacher, and it does not require much imagination to suppose that the explanation will not in some cases redound to the credit of the Government. On the one hand, teachers and schoolboys are ordered not to meddle with politics; while, on the other, they are forced to study a book which presents only the official case of the whole *raison d'être* of the Government of India. To say the least, such a policy appears to be somewhat inconsistent and unreasonable, and as such it is certain to be resented."

[1] "In the debating societies which the students are sure to found, an English professor would have an opportunity of setting forth his views at length, and he would indeed be unfortunate in his endowments if he could not succeed in dismissing the case against the Government as it is usually presented" (*Imperial Rule in India*, p. 120).

ance. That function may be characterized as the ministry of reconciliation between the East and the West. I cannot be wrong in thinking that the ultimate aim of England's policy in regard to the higher education of Indians is to train the best minds in India to understand England—to learn its history, its literature, the science which has given it its power and its wealth, and, what is of still greater importance, the spiritual ideas which underlie and hold together its national life. And having learnt these things, England expects that the favoured recipients of this knowledge will take their position as connecting-links between their countrymen and themselves, interpreting to the masses of their countrymen, who are necessarily deprived of the advantages which have been placed within their reach, the aim and spirit of British rule, spreading the knowledge they have themselves been helped to gain, and thus helping England to govern a foreign race so as to secure the contentment and progress of the millions committed to her care."

Such knowledge is certainly not spread by the vernacular Press, which seems to find (as might be expected) better opportunities of increasing its circulation in vilifying the measures of Government than in any other way.[1] Vernacular news-

[1] What was stated by Lord Lytton thirty years ago seems to be equally true to-day: "Written, for the most part, by persons

papers, of which, in 1907, there were 753 in all (besides 1062 periodicals), are not, as a rule, profitable concerns;[1] and the journalists as a class seem to be largely recruited (as has been already pointed out) from the ranks of unsuccessful college students, who have little opportunity, even if they had the will, to keep themselves well-informed on broad matters of Governmental policy.[2]

very imperfectly educated and altogether inexperienced; written, moreover, down to the level of the lowest intelligence, and with an undisguised appeal to the most disloyal sentiments and mischievous passions . . . these journals are read only, or chiefly, by persons still more ignorant, still more uneducated, still more inexperienced than the writers of them; persons wholly unable to judge for themselves, and entirely dependent for their interpretation of our action upon these self-constituted and incompetent teachers. Not content with misrepresenting the Government and maligning the character of the ruling race in every possible way and on every possible occasion, these mischievous scribblers have of late been preaching open sedition" (Speech in Council on the Vernacular Press Bill, 14 March, 1878, quoted by Lady Betty Balfour, *Lord Lytton's Indian Administration*, p. 512).

[1] "Many of these are unimportant journals of an ephemeral character with a circulation of a few hundreds only, and the number with a circulation exceeding 2000 copies is still small" (*Memorandum on Indian Administration*, 1909 [Cd. 4956]).

[2] "Indigenous Indian newspapers pay badly, as their circulation is not large and their readers are mostly poor. In the infrequent case of the proprietor being a rich man, he is seldom liberal to his staff. On the whole, it may be said of Indians editing papers that the majority are men of small experience, and, though clever and ambitious, are already soured against the British Government; further, that, as little that is done by the Government or by British officials is so transparently right as not to be susceptible to misconstruction or adverse criticism, such editors, to the small extent of their knowledge, inculcate a good deal of error, and are more prone to indulge in hostile than favourable

§ 53. Among the different social and political groups in India whose activities are clearly discernible and capable to some extent of being satisfactorily estimated, the Congress party may be taken as that which represents pre-eminently the higher secular education. A careful study of their literature and their public actions, in the light of their special social environment, will do more perhaps than any other investigation to answer the questions with which we are concerned. The Congress historian will find it no easy task to separate out the different threads of policy that are due to the presence of selfish sectional interests within this heterogeneous party, a task which will be necessary before he can attempt to pass judgment on its work as a whole. The mere partisan observer will easily dismiss the whole movement with a few savage diatribes couched in the tone in which Mr. Masterman describes the "Condition of England." For even the most sympathetic of the supporters of Congress must admit that its activities are not ideally disinterested, tactful, or sagacious,—any more than

comments. . . . There are, of course, exceptions, for amongst the editors may be found men of high literary attainments. . . . But such men are rare . . . and some of them are so straitened pecuniarily that, viewing the monopoly of highly-paid appointments enjoyed by Englishmen, their minds are sometimes appreciably embittered against the Government" (Mr. S. S. Thorburn, "Education by Newspaper," *The Asiatic Quarterly*, July 1902).

are the activities of political and social parties in England. But in serious discussions of political movements comparisons of the actual and the ideal are obviously unreasonable, and we shall endeavour to steer clear of all such unreasonableness.

§ 54. The Congress, it should be mentioned, is not strictly a deliberative body. As Sir Pherozeshah Mehta, when chairman of the Reception Committee (1904), has put it: "It would be absurd to say that the Congress meets to deliberate or discuss and decide all the important subjects with which it deals. That task must be, and is, largely performed in the course of the year by such institutions as we may possess for forming Indian public opinion, in the common intercourse of daily life, in local bodies more or less active, in the Native Press, which is undoubtedly growing more and more capable and potent. At the end of the year we all meet together from different parts of the country, representatives of the people, not selected, it is true, by any authoritative or scientific process, but still representatives in all the various ways in which virtual representation works itself out in the early stages of its progressive development, representatives who are of the people and in immediate touch and contact with them, representatives realizing in themselves the wants, the wishes, the sentiments, the aspira-

tions of the people, representatives whose education has qualified them to ponder over grave questions of policy and principle in their application to the administration and government of this country in all their complex relations of a foreign rule, representatives into whom education has instilled an earnest, devoted, and enlightened loyalty to the British Crown and a keen solicitude for the safety and permanence of the British Empire, in which they are firmly persuaded lie implanted the roots of the welfare, the prosperity, and the good government of this country—I say, we delegates, representatives of the people, meet together at the end of the year to give voice to the public opinion of the country taking shape and formulating throughout the year, to present our Petition of Rights, our Grand Remonstrance, our appeal and our prayer for a firm and unfaltering grasp of a policy of wisdom and righteousness, for the reversal of retrograde measures inconsistent with such a policy, and for the adoption of means steadily ensuring the gradual development of free political progress 'broadening slowly down from precedent to precedent.'"

The Congress meets for only three days in the year, and carries out a programme prepared by a committee which debates in secret. This committee selects speakers to advocate particular

measures. The orators deliver set harangues, and the resolutions proposed are carried unanimously.

What strikes one most forcibly in glancing down the series of resolutions is that while there is invariably placed in the forefront a demand for lessened taxation, a considerable number of the other proposals call for largely increased expenditure. But such inconsistencies, of course, are to be found in the programmes of most parliamentary oppositions; and the Congress politicians are not kept in check by the consideration that they themselves may have to give effect to their own programme. The speeches taken in the mass are very decorous and fairly reasonable, though not, apparently, based on very full or accurate knowledge of the topics treated. Occasional speeches are admirable.

Writing in 1898, Mr. Eardley Norton says: "Were I a statesman and in office I should be proud of this wonderful exhibition of the development of English education. I would point with exultation to its peaceful, orderly assembly, to the discipline of its meetings, to its ready and cheerful obedience to its President, to its grateful acknowledgment of the manifold blessings of British rule, to the sober language of its demands, to the very demands themselves, as necessary and intended results of our education, of our promises, and of

our policy; and I would boast, as I believe I could boast truthfully, that no country in the world but my own could in so short a time have transformed the India of yesterday into the India of to-day."[1] He goes on to quote passages from Sir Wm. Hunter: "I affirm that there is no political movement in the country which is managed with the same moderation of speech and the same dignity of procedure as this, the Indian National Congress" (1889). . . . "I may therefore briefly say that those political movements are the legitimate and inevitable result of Western education in India. The men who conduct them are the men to whom in all other respects, intellectual and moral, we are accustomed to point as the highest products of British rule in India. They are the men who form the natural interpreters of our rule to the masses of the people. To speak of such men, when their activity takes a political direction, as disaffected, would be equally unjust and untrue" (1890).[2]

The split which occurred in 1907, when the Extremist section refused to fall in with the rulings of a Moderate President and Committee, may seem to detract a good deal from these eulo-

[1] *Indian Politics,* Madras, 1898, p. 26.

[2] Even in an Anglo-Indian journal (*The Indian Daily News,* Calcutta) appears the following admission: "A loyal, critical, unofficial opposition—that, we think, sums up the position of the Congress pretty fairly."

gies. But similar breakdowns occur over and over again in the legislatures of countries (such as Austria) where Parliament has the right to criticize, but no power to control, the Executive. Moreover, the Moderate section seems to have very quickly and satisfactorily reconstituted itself as the National Congress.[1]

§ 55. The Congress party is certainly the party of disloyalty in the narrower sense of that word. But it is still more the party of conscious political ideals, however much its aims may be permeated by class selfishness. "The dignity of the true statesman's work" (says Mr. J. N. Farquhar, Professor of English, Bhawanipur) "and the value of all faithful toil done for the State are now commonplaces on the Congress platform."[2] For one among many of the expressions of this new-born sense of political duty we may turn to the prayer with which the National Congress was opened in Calcutta. The ideas as well as the phraseology are borrowed from English Christianity; and they may be, and probably are, very imperfectly grasped. Yet even outward homage to such ideals is itself a sign of progress, and likely, by familiarizing the party with the principles that should underlie political action, to

[1] See *Proceedings of the Twenty-third Indian National Congress*, Madras, 1909.

[2] *Contemporary Review*, May 1908.

favour further progress and lead on to fuller ethical gains. No doubt this is less certain in the case of Indians (by whom the logical connection between words and actions seems always very hazily grasped) than might at first sight appear; but the necessity of justifying political and social actions by reference to the highest Western ideals can hardly fail absolutely of all result. The words of the prayer are quoted in Mr. Farquhar's article.

"O most Gracious God and Father, by whose Divine Providence mankind is ruled and all things are made to work out His good ends, we thank Thee for enabling us, Thy unworthy servants, to assemble once more in this great city for this the twenty-second session of our National Congress. We bless Thy Holy Name that Thou didst put into the hearts of our leaders, some of whom have now departed this life, to establish this Congress, and didst grant them wisdom and ability to maintain and develop it in the face of manifold and vast difficulties. We heartily thank Thee for the measure of usefulness granted to our Congress in the past, in drawing together in the bonds of friendship, fellowship, and united effort our countrymen, separated as they are by difference of race, creed, language, and social customs. We also render Thee most humble and hearty thanks for the marvellous

growth of the true spirit of Nationalism which has recently manifested itself in all parts of our beloved motherland.

"We seek Thy blessing, O Heavenly Father, on the proceedings of the present session of our Congress. Give to the President and to all speakers the guidance of Thy Holy Spirit, so that nothing may be said or done here that is not in accordance with Thy Holy Will. Remove from us all ill-feeling, prejudice, and uncharitableness, and fill our hearts with a genuine desire for the good of the country and its people, with unswerving loyalty to our rulers, and with good feelings towards all sections of the inhabitants of this land. Let moderation and earnestness, wisdom and charity, humility and harmony characterize our proceedings at this great gathering.

"We implore Thy blessing on our Gracious Sovereign and Emperor, King Edward, and on the Royal Family. Enable those that bear rule in this land under His Imperial Majesty to realize their unique responsibilities consequent on their position which Thou hast been pleased to grant them, and help them to fulfil the sacred charge committed to them, so as to glorify Thy Name and to benefit our people. More especially at this time we beseech Thee, O Lord, to inspire all the members of the ruling race with true

sympathy for the people over whom Thou hast placed them as rulers.

"O merciful God, we seek Thy guidance and help in checking and uprooting all the evils which hinder our progress and improvement as a people. Enable us to make ourselves worthy in every respect for the privileges of self-government and participation in the administration of the country which we seek and claim. Pardon our many shortcomings, strengthen our infirmities, bless our labours, and bestow on us such a measure of success as Thou thinkest fit. Grant us the spirit of self-effacement and self-sacrifice, and accept our humble services to the glory of Thy Holy Name, and the good of our beloved motherland. Amen."

§ 56. As regards the speeches and writings of the Congress party, one is always hearing the charge that they are violently seditious.[1] Defen-

[1] The practice adopted by papers as discreet as *The Times*, of persistently arguing that men like Mr. Banerjea are insidiously disloyal and promoters of sedition, at a time when Mr. Krishnavarma in *The Indian Sociologist* (see, e.g., Vol. V, No. 7, July 1909) is calling Mr. Banerjea "a sycophant" and a "self-seeking flatterer" whose "obsequious conduct" emphasizes "his moral turpitude," hardly seems the wisest course for a sane imperialist policy to follow. The fact that one "political" assassin referred to Mr. Banerjea's writings among others as his source of inspiration is no proof of anarchical tendencies in those writings. Similar gloomy-minded fanatics would doubtless find equally strong incentives to political murders in the pages of the less reputable of the English journals with a "socialistic" bias.

ders of the Congress are always repudiating it. The impression that I gather myself from the perusal of a considerable amount of such matter is that both accusation and repudiation are, in most cases, put forward in good faith. Many times the Congress politicians are genuinely astonished at some flagrant utterance being treated as unjustifiable. In a considerable proportion of cases I believe the misunderstanding, when closely analyzed, will be found to be in part a difference in political manners and in part a consequence of linguistic difficulties. A very slight turn of phrase may, unintentionally, convert a respectful protest into an intolerable demand—the misuse of an auxiliary verb—some slight *nuance* in the use of an adjective. This is a very real cause of serious misunderstandings. It is a point that has been brought home to me by the way in which I have frequently been approached, by letter or in person, by Indian students whose obvious interest it was, in presenting some request, to be as conciliatory as possible. Yet some of the expressions they would use, intermixed with painstakingly respectful sentences, would be of a kind that at first hearing seemed to call for indignant rebuke. Not a little thought was required sometimes, before one could realize how trifling an alteration —the substitution, say, of "may" for "must," "request" for "desire"—would suffice to give

the question a satisfactory shape.[1] Such shades of difference in expression may be pure matters of idiom or involve also questions of taste. In either case the hitting of the exactly appropriate phraseology is ultimately a matter of scholarship, and often of very delicate scholarship. This neither party understands. The unintentionally offensive speaker is treated by Englishmen as a dangerous sedition-monger, and his compatriots are amazed to see him singled out for disloyalty, when Englishmen or Irishmen who use what to them may appear much more outrageous expressions are left unrebuked.

Even when the objectionable utterances are not thus susceptible of being resolved into linguistic misunderstandings, it should not be forgotten that political manners differ from country to country as well as from century to century. We must keep clear of the error (natural enough, it is true) of condemning our own work in the East and of dealing in gloomy forecasts for India, because we find that contemporary India does not coincide with our ideal. A great deal of what seems to us, in the nascent political life of India, outrageous, and indeed intolerable, could doubtless be paralleled without

[1] I once received a most friendly letter from a former pupil referring with regret to my lectures, "*interesting and tedious as they were.*"

much difficulty among the platform utterances and newspaper articles of America and the Continent, and, indeed, in the journalism of eighteenth-century England.[1] It is natural, moreover, for Orientals, as it is for southern Europeans, to deal in superlatives. "An impartial judge of native comments" (writes a native of India[2]) "will also make some allowance for the emotional character of the Oriental mind and its traditional habit of indulging in spirited and hyperbolical language."

§ 57. The Indian would-be statesman lacks the sort of training which is ours almost from childhood—the quasi-political training of the public school especially, where we acquire the elements at least of political sagacity and learn to give and take in reasonable measure. Even the politicians of Continental Europe show, con-

[1] Since writing the above I have come across the following paragraph from Malthus, quoted in Toynbee's *The Industrial Revolution*, chap. IX.: "During the late dearth half of the gentlemen and clergy in the kingdom richly deserved to have been prosecuted for sedition. After inflaming the minds of the common people against the farmers and corn-dealers by the manner in which they talked of them or preached about them, it was a feeble antidote to the poison which they had infused coldly to observe that, however the poor might be oppressed or cheated, it was their duty to keep the peace" (*Principle of Population*, 7th ed., p. 438, *note*). . . . It reads like an attack on the double dealing of Messrs. Banerjea and Lala Lajpat Rai in the *National Review*, or a leading article on the same subject in the *The Times*.

[2] Mr. A. P. Sen, "Education and Sedition in India," *Westminster Review*, August 1902.

spicuously at times, signs of the inadequate nature of their experience in such matters. The management of school clubs, the prefect system, the life of the cricket field and the dormitory, all leave their mark on the growing English boy.[1] Rarely indeed—unless it be in the chiefs' colleges[2] and perhaps a few places like Aligarh and Trinity College, Kandy[3]—has the Indian known any such preparation for life.[4]

[1] The political value of this sort of training is discussed at length in E. Demolin's *A quoi tient la supériorité des Anglo-Saxons?*

[2] "Nothing in the nature of a social student life begins to make its appearance until we come to the highest aristocratic institutions" (Mr. Yusuf Ali, *Life and Labour of the People of India*, 1907, p. 149).

[3] "In Trinity College, Kandy, the discipline and leadership of the college and school was largely entrusted to the boys and students themselves. After two years' work the results were so marked that when the Principal was invalided home, the then Governor of Ceylon, Sir Henry Blake, G.C.M.G., wrote to him: 'In my opinion you have done exceptional service to education in Ceylon by the line that you have taken in Trinity College, where the development of manly qualities, without which education is but a broken reed, receives its due proportion in the teaching and training of the boys'" (Mr. A. G. Fraser, *Education in India and Ceylon*, Aberdeen, 1908, p. 28).

[4] It is this fact which makes arguments in favour of the perfectly equal treatment of English and Indian candidates for the Civil Service (by simultaneous examinations in London and India, for example) completely beside the point. The Civil Service examination does not pick out the most suitable candidates for administrative work. The present system really assumes that there are thousands of quite capable youths in England, and examinational competition is introduced, not because it is good in itself, but because it is a convenient check on favouritism. The fact that many hundreds of Indian candidates could *in*

The attempt to make the control of athletics a matter of student self-government has been known to fail utterly in a University college where two religious sects have been evenly balanced in numbers, as every committee election, every selection of a cricket team was made a matter of racial and religious feud. Autocratic intervention on the part of the English professors has been necessitated in order to remedy glaring injustices brought about by a chance-majority vote, and tenaciously upheld on the sternest "constitutional" principles by the unpatriotic offenders, who were willing, if not eager, to sacrifice the prestige of their college in intercollegiate competitions, if by so doing they could feel that they were championing the interests of Religion.[1]

The Indian agitator (with rare exceptions) has not learned the wisdom of moderation. He attacks indiscriminately the good and the bad actions of government, with the zest of a schoolboy playing at a new game and the bitterness of one who believes that his personal aspirations are debarred

the examination-room do as well as, or better than, the selected candidates, is no argument whatever for equalizing the conditions, but rather the reverse. As it is, the system necessarily cuts out a number of the best in favour of the second-best candidates. It seems, however, the wisest system in the circumstances.

[1] This I can vouch for from personal experience. Cf. also Dr. Miller's remarks in the *Madras Christian College Magazine* for January 1908.

from a legitimate outlet in an administrative career.[1] The game of politics is new to him. He has learned it from newspapers and books. He does not realize the difference in controversial tone and social environment which makes the game in twentieth-century England a very different one from what it can become in India. He overlooks, too, in most cases, the difference between party strife in a country with responsible self-government, and class opposition in a country where the Government must necessarily remain autocratic. Unfortunately his English sympathizers (especially certain sections of the Liberal Press and a group of ill-informed members of Parliament) overlook this difference also.

As Mr. Mitra puts it: "An attack made on the Government of India by the National Congress or by the Vernacular Press is not like the attack of an organized opposition on the Government of the day. There is no system of party in India. Those

[1] A curious instance of his capacity for inconsistency in argument is seen in the perennial attacks, made both by the Congress party and their English parliamentary friends, on the venality and tyranny of the police in India, while they perpetually insist on the moral fitness of the Indian for every kind of administrative work. Apparently we have chosen none but the morally unfit for service in the police! Or is it that the contact of the Indian with the Englishman in this department invariably causes moral degeneration? . . . More probably the real reason is that, to certain types of mind, police work is especially closely identified with Governmental activities; and everything that the Government in India does is bad.

who attack the Government know that they cannot hope to turn them out, but they proceed as if they could do so. It is an axiom in Indian politics that the Government of India cannot allow itself to be beaten."[1]

§ 58. It is the absence of racial unification and class equality which makes autocratic rule (however much tempered by consideration for the governed, and modified by frequent consultation with representatives of the subject peoples) an abiding necessity as long as the caste system holds sway and racial and religious antipathies remain what they are to-day. The Congress politician crying out for representative institutions stands in the same position as the Roman oligarch of yore, protesting, "I was born free as Cæsar; so were you . . . "; yet (in true oligarch fashion) never casting a thought in the direction of the great mass of the subject population of Rome. A share in political domination the educated Indian naturally craves. But the Provincials—the struggling *ryots*—still prefer, it would seem, the rule of an alien Cæsar to the rule of a native clique.

"Many able and conscientious men" (writes a judge of the High Court of Bombay[2]) "take their stand in dealing with the Indian problem upon a

[1] *Indian Problems*, 1908, p. 7.

[2] Mr. Justice Beaman, "The Situation in India," *Empire Review*, February 1909.

fundamental principle. All people have the right to be free. No country has the right to hold the peoples of another country or continent in subjection and deny them equal rights of free citizenship. As an abstract proposition in the domain of national ethics few can dispute the principle. But when it is sought to be applied practically to the complex problem of Indian government, it will be found to imply some conditions which do not exist and never have existed.

"It implies that we found India 'free' and enslaved her. It implies that there is a people in India struggling to be free, and that we repress it. It implies a homogeneity of race, religion, and sentiment throughout India, the very reverse of what we really find there. It implies an Indian 'nation'; but there is no Indian nation. It implies that India, like France or England, is a country, while everyone knows that it is a continent. It is a continent full of jarring and hostile elements, a continent of which the numerous peoples and tribes are only kept in restraint by the compelling power of England. If there were, as the exponents of this principle seem to believe, an Indian nation aspiring to be free; if the English rule suppressed by force that aspiration, and imposed upon the weak but unwilling necks of millions the yoke of a foreign tyranny, I do not think that any genuine Englishman could be

found to defend the morality of such a position. But were the facts so, or nearly so, there would be no need of any moral discussion. Two or three hundred million people animated by a common patriotism, by a common resolve to be free, certainly could not be kept in subjection by such means as England uses in India for a single day."

These are facts which it is not easy for the English politician or the English journalist to grasp so firmly as never to let them slip from his memory when he is handling a concrete Indian problem. They are, however, repeatedly ignored by writers who certainly cannot urge the excuse of ignorance.

§ 59. The Congress party is freely accused of being a selfish and partisan body representing the interests of unimportant coteries. "Mr. Niel Groïs, a graduate of Harvard University, and a student of international affairs . . . was struck by the fact that the Congress at Calcutta was a collection of office-seekers, not of patriots, and in a speech delivered at Boston last year he explained the special opportunities of studying Indian problems he had enjoyed, and compared the disloyalty of the educated classes with the devotion of the masses, who realized that their safety, and in fact their entire well-being, depended on the continuance of British rule."[1] "It

[1] Mr. J. D. Rees, *The Real India* (1908), p. 212.

is becoming increasingly obvious," writes Mr. T. V. Subrahmanyam,[1] "that the institution has ceased to be popular, that it is preserved as the organ of a few, and that its resolutions cannot be said to have the sanction of the people at large. It was only the other day that the *Amrita Bazar Patrika* [a leading Congress organ] was forced to confess that the so-called National Assembly was the preserve of a few people who could make a speech in English."

Whether the protests raised in Congress and re-echoed in all parts of India over such matters as the Partition of Bengal and the Universities Act—to take the two stock grievances of the Congress politician—were intelligent or disinterested is indeed very dubious. The weight of evidence seems in the former case all in favour of the view that the agitation was largely engineered in the interests of small coteries of educated Hindus desirous of maintaining the preponderance of Hindu officials in the Mohammedan section of the province and of retaining Calcutta as the centre of legal and administrative business for the larger area.[2] The whole controversy,

[1] "The Indian National Congress," *Calcutta Review*, April 1904.

[2] "Around the courts of the judges and magistrates the native lawyers congregate, and while their advocacy may insure the thorough sifting of the evidence on both sides, it is feared that in many cases they foment quarrels and foster litigation for their

however, is most bewildering. Lord Morley, in his speech at Arbroath (21st October, 1907), certainly rejected the theory that the agitation was purely artificial, not based on existing and widely-felt discontent. After considerable wearisome study of Congress speeches and of articles in the pages of *India* (the weekly organ of the Congress party published in England), I find myself completely baffled by the whole question. The only tangible objections that appear to be raised against the Partition seem to imply that some sections of the population may lose advantages which other sections will gain; and the sympathies of the Congress happen to be with the former rather than the latter. But what exactly the losses (if any) amount to, and whether there can possibly be any net losses, are questions that it seems almost impossible to answer with confidence, the whole of the controversial ground being now so overgrown with a jungle of misrepresentations that clear

own advantage. The substantial professional incomes made by this very numerous body of lawyers scattered throughout the districts of India are drawn from the pockets of ryot farmers and cultivators, and constitute a burden from which they were originally free, and which, whatever its merits or its defects, is one of the outcomes of the present educational system. These legal coteries throughout the country are centres whence spread the restless ideas and political aspirations that pervade so large a section of the educated community" (*The Edinburgh Review*, October 1907, p. 272).

vision is impossible. One can only re-echo the words of Lord Morley: "It is the vagueness of the discontent, which is not universal, but of the discontent so far as we can perceive it—it is the vagueness that makes it harder to understand, harder to deal with. Some of them are angry with me. Why? Because I have not been able to give them the moon. I have got no moon, and if I had I would not give them the moon. I would not give anybody the moon, because I do not know who lives there. I do not know what kind of conditions prevail. But, seriously, I read pretty carefully—not very pleasant reading—I read much of the Press in which their aspirations are put forth. . . . But I declare to you I cannot find what it is precisely they want us to do which we are not anxious slowly and gradually to make a way for eventually doing. But there must be patience and there must be, whatever else there is, firmness." "It is impossible to read the narrative of the controversy," says a former Bishop of Bombay,[1] "without deploring the prejudice and pusillanimity which underlies the native side of it. The larger considerations which appeal to statesmanship are ignored, while the smaller and more personal aspects of the question are strongly pressed."

[1] The Bishop of Southampton, in *The East and the West*, January 1908.

Similarly with regard to the Universities question: "The scheme of reform was under consideration when I left India. It occasioned the strongest feeling, and what impressed one chiefly in the controversy was the weight given to mere personal considerations. . . . There seemed to be little anxiety to get at the real merits of the question; to arrive at the best settlement in the light of efficiency; to think out impartially such a constitution of the governing body as would best promote the usefulness of the university and lend most value to its educational work."[1]

§ 60. The Congress, it is further urged, represents the selfish Hindu point of view only. That it is almost entirely repudiated by the Moslem element, is true enough;[2] but this is in part due to the educational backwardness of the Moslem community, and in part also to the personal influence of Sir Syed Ahmad Khan, the founder of Aligarh College, who always deprecated political activity before the Moslems should have strengthened their position by broadening through education their intellectual outlook.

Its non-representative character is very forcibly

[1] *Ibid.*

[2] Out of 626 members present at the twenty-third Congress (1908) I can count only eight Mohammedans. In 1904, out of 1010 they numbered thirty-one. (The Mohammedans number about one-fifth of the population of India; more than the population of any single European State except Russia, and perhaps Germany.)

described by a somewhat hostile critic, Sir G. Chesney. He emphasizes the smallness and what he believes to be the political insignificance of the section from which most of its members are drawn; but hardly succeeds in showing conclusively that a Western Government fostering Western ideas should not give to them and their ambitions a larger measure of attention than the bulk of the people, Mohammedans and uneducated Hindus, might approve. "Among the special elements of difficulty at the present time" (he writes),[1] "is the appearance on the surface of Indian society of a new class—a class which has no affinity with the landed aristocracy or the natural rulers[2] of India,

[1] *Indian Polity*, 3rd ed., 1894, pp. 380–1.

[2] There is, of course, no simple test for deciding what classes (if any) are "the natural rulers" of a people. The Rev. J. A. Sharrock, late Principal of the S.P.G. College, Trichinopoly, points out in the *Nineteenth Century* for September 1909 ("Some Misconceptions about the Unrest in India") that the Brahmins, who constitute only 5 per cent. of the total population, furnish 85 per cent. of the University graduates. A soldier would doubtless deny that a priestly class has any "natural" title to political power; but India has always shown some tendency to pass under sacerdotal domination. Though the new Indian claimant for power always puts forward "education" as the ground of his claim, it is not easy to guess to what extent caste claims of a semi-sacerdotal character occupy his mind. Naturally such claims will be kept in the background when he is holding converse with Englishmen; and the assumption (probably, though not certainly correct) that the non-Oriental claim of educational superiority is what really fills his thoughts runs through all the literature that deals with Congress and the Universities. Such a claim, however, is not incompatible with a naïvely unquestioning belief in

or the mercantile, or the agricultural communities; which has never before occupied a position of any importance; a class which is the product of our system of free [*sic*] education, and which, while constituting a numerically insignificant minority of the whole population, lays claim to be accepted as the people of India, and, with the assistance it is endeavouring to secure from an uninstructed section of English politicians, is entering on a course of political agitation—vague, unreal, and impracticable in its aims, but which, unless directed into a rational course, may bring about trouble and danger to India. The vast majority of the people of India, on the other hand, although the agitation now being got up among a section of the small English-speaking class necessarily excites among them a vague feeling of unrest and expectation, are still politically in an elementary condition to which no part of Europe furnishes anything analogous. The questions which we are told exercise the minds of the people of India, such as the expansion of the legislative councils, the constitution of the Civil Service, and so forth, are at present absolutely beyond their apprehension. Their notions of the nature of the Govern-

caste distinctions, and an expectation on the part of Brahmin graduates of retaining political power, under a representative system, by influencing the votes of "natural" inferiors and by other ways of manipulating the political machine.

ment they are ruled by are of the vaguest. To them the Government is represented by three or four district officials with whom they come in contact; these they see to be acting under higher authority, but as to the nature of this they have only the vaguest notions, while of the Government in England, with its parliament and political parties, they have no more conception than of the composition of the solar system. Representative institutions, franchises, voting, elections, the simpler political questions which are coming to be understood by all classes in Europe do not enter even in the most remote way into their thoughts. This is a class of whose wants and feelings little or nothing is heard in the so-called political discussions now going on in India; yet it outnumbers the other class by thousands to one, and it is mainly in their interests that the Government has to be conducted."

This last point is also emphasized by the American missionary, Dr. J. P. Jones: "It is certainly the business of Great Britain to discover and consult the wishes of the people—not the hungry office seekers—in this matter. After many years of observation and living among the people, the writer is convinced that nine-tenths of the people would be prepared any day to vote in favour of the relative increase, and not the decrease, of the European official force. . . . The

writer knows how general is the want of native confidence in natives. Many a time has he been importuned to use his influence to have cases transferred from the jurisdiction of the native to the Englishman." . . . "The presence of the few English dignitaries" (he adds) "does ten times more good to the land in purifying and toning up the service than their salary is worth."[1]

It is, of course, a point to which the Congress party denies any importance or any truth. Says a native member of the Legislative Council of India[2] on one occasion: "Lord Curzon . . . told his hearers . . . that even if he had incurred the hostility of educated Indians, the masses would be grateful to him for what he had done for them. This attempt to distinguish between the interests of the educated classes and those of the bulk of their countrymen is a favourite device with those who seek to repress the legitimate aspirations of our people. . . . We know, of course, that the distinction is unreal and ridiculous, and we know also that most of those who use it as a convenient means to disparage the educated classes cannot themselves really believe in it."[3]

[1] "British Rule in India," *North American Review*, April 1899.

[2] Mr. G. K. Gokhale, in his Presidential Address before the Indian National Congress, 1905.

[3] It is hardly necessary to linger over the familiar truth that the Congress party is drawn preponderantly from the less warlike

As soon, however, as one turns from the heated atmosphere of Congress discussions and the unsavoury declamations of the friends of Congress in the House of Commons, and opens such a book as Sir F. S. P. Lely's sympathetic little brochure (*Suggestions for the Better Governing of India*),[1] he feels himself at once in a different world. Here we get the peasants' point of view, set forth by one who evidently knows them at close quarters and who certainly holds no brief for the Government as it is. But the "reforms" for which Congress clamours are conspicuous by their absence. Congress gets scarcely a mention from cover to cover; yet it is hardly possible

peoples—those that, but for British protection, would speedily fall a prey to their more vigorous neighbours. "The men who are at present most prominent, who are spoken of as leaders of the popular party, do not really represent any large or important section. They represent class interests, essentially pacific. They are almost to a man the creatures of our own educational system, using the argot of Western reformers and revolutionaries. It suits them to talk very loud, to use high-sounding phrases. But they know, every one knows, that should they reap the whirlwind for which they diligently busy themselves sowing the wind, they would be the first to disappear" (Mr. Justice Beaman, "The Situation in India," *Empire Review*, February 1909). It is a little strange, however, that the claim (whether just or genuine is another matter) of a section of the people that they, as being thoroughly Westernized by English education, are the right people to be entrusted with political power, should be thus lightly treated with scorn by writers like Mr. Beaman and Sir George Chesney—as if on the surface it were a grotesque and preposterous claim.

[1] London, 1906; price 1s. 3d.

to read the essay through without a conviction that here, at last, is an author who really aims at presenting what are the genuine grievances and the actual aspirations of over 90 per cent of the people.

§ 61. That the Congress party is swayed by class interests may be freely admitted. What political party in history has not been so swayed? But the Congress certainly stands for Western political ideals, and much of its programme consists of what, on *a priori* reasoning, the Liberalism of Europe would be bound to approve. That the literary class, the lawyers, the potential office-holders, would benefit by the spread of liberal principles of government (as understood in England) does not prevent their interest in Liberalism being genuine.

Nor is it reasonable to argue that because both their aims and methods are exotics, introduced into India from the alien West, these aims and methods must be the products of insincere imitation. The methods of Congress are of course not the natural methods of the East, any more than they are faithful copies in detail of the methods of the West. "Orthodox Hindus of the old school" (says Sir Theodore Morison) "have been offended at the pretensions of the Congress politicians to represent Hindu society, seeing that their manners and methods of political

agitation are flagrantly foreign to Indian ideas."[1] But for the Congress party to refrain from adopting Western methods in their agitation, while such a course might enhance their appearance of sincerity, would hardly be evidence of their political sagacity.

What, however, are we to say of their ultimate aims? In so far as these are disinterestedly patriotic they ought to be bent towards securing for their country a fuller realization of self-respecting Statehood.

The mention of such an aspiration as this in a Western land would at once suggest the double aim of attaining complete independence from foreign control and of introducing some democratic system of representative government. The Indian is intellectually imitative, and the Congress Indian is the Indian who knows something of Western aspirations. Nothing therefore is more natural than that Congress politicians, while postponing the dubious benefits that would follow the withdrawal of British control, should press forward towards the goal of representative institutions.

This, however, is by no means the accustomed aspiration of the uneducated Indian. His desire is distinctly for good patriarchal government. Loyalty to a personal monarch comes easy to

[1] *Imperial Rule in India*, 1899, p. 9.

him. He is not even eagerly bent on having a ruler of the same nationality as himself. The Nizam, a Mohammedan, speaking Urdu, reigns over Hindus whose native tongues are Telegu, Canarese, or Mahratti; nor will the Gaekwar of Baroda be found ruling over populations composed preponderantly of Mahrattas. Yet these princes do not seem to have any difficulty in winning the loyalty of their subjects, and that though neither of them can show a genuinely ancient title to their allegiance. Even the English Emperor-King receives an unexpectedly large share of veneration in India. For the monarchical sentiment is a deep-seated instinct among the races that dwell east of Suez.[1]

By this we do not, of course, mean to imply that the Oriental any more than the European wishes to be ruled in accordance with the changing caprices of an inscrutable despot whose ways are not his own ways and who never condescends to explain, when explanation is necessary, why he wills what he wills. As an Anglo-Indian paper[2] points out: "It is too late to reiterate the familiar notion that the East desires good government through a benevolent despot, and looks on self-government with contempt. If the

[1] Cf. Mr. A. M. T. Jackson, I.C.S., "The Hindu Theory of Government," *Empire Review*, September 1907.

[2] *Times of India*, 7 August, 1909.

'benevolent despot' is one who pursues his own way, regardless of what his subjects think, then he has passed from the scene of government in India, and it is useless to go on holding him up as an ideal. An authoritative government, whose rule is conditioned by a careful regard for the informed and reasonably expressed opinion of the people who are ruled, is another matter." Even an Indian rajah can be found to insist on the same point.[1] "Again, when the public journals question the justice or wisdom of any action of Government, Government should condescend to afford explanations oftener and more fully than heretofore. Such explanations would, in many cases, clear up matters and obviate dissatisfaction. A good and strong Government ought not to hesitate to take the people into its confidence."[2]

§ 62. Discussing the aspirations of New India before the Royal Colonial Institute, Sir Bampfylde Fuller is reported[3] as saying: "If the eyes of the Indian people were not turned to democratic ideals, what was it they were looking for? It might safely be concluded that if the extrava-

[1] Raja Sir T. Madava Row, K.C.S.I., *Political Opinions* (Madras, 1890), p. 4.

[2] Cf. also Sir Theodore Morison, *Imperial Rule in India*, p. 37: "The Government which wishes to create a national spirit must be based upon a principle which its subjects can reciprocate; it must place before the people a conception of Government which will evoke their enthusiastic loyalty."

[3] *India*, 18 June, 1909.

gant utterances of extremist politicians found a hearing, it was not because the Indian people wished to see the end of British rule. He believed that their grievance was primarily sentimental, that uppermost in their minds was a vague feeling of resentment at being treated always as inferior to Europeans. . . . His conclusions were that one could learn very little as to the real wishes of India from the recent manifestations of unrest; that the heartfelt desire of the people was to acquire a self-respect which had been lost during years of subjection; that the best method of meeting this desire was to prove to them that they were not barred from positions of trust and dignity in the service of the country; and that, if this concession was granted, they would remain very well content with methods of government which might not realize the democratic ideals of Englishmen, but which satisfied the present needs of a large portion of Europe."

§ 63. The Congress speakers clamour, and very naturally, for more of the loaves and fishes of office. They almost certainly do not desire a severance of the English connection. On this point testimony seems practically unanimous.

To quote one of themselves:[1] "The educated Indian has his faults, but whatever these faults

[1] Mr. W. C. Bonnerjee, Bar.-at-law, *Indian Politics* (Madras, 1898), Introd. p. 5.

may be it cannot be asserted that he is blind to his own material interests, and it is his own material interests that sway him altogether towards being loyal and contented, as loyal subjects should be contented, towards the Government. Indeed, the principle on which the Indian National Congress is based is that British rule should be permanent and abiding in India, and that, given this axiom, it is the duty of educated Indians to endeavour to the best of their power to help their rulers so to govern the country as to improve her material prosperity and make the people of all classes and communities happy and prosperous and contented as subjects of the British Empire. The sooner this erroneous but very mischievous notion that the educated Indian is seditious is given up, the better for the country." "These men" (says one of their English coadjutors[1]) "are not paid demagogues or political incendiaries with no stake in the land. Their material well-being is bound up with British rule. They comprise, educationally, the pick and flower of all the trades and professions in India. Many of them are wealthy landowners, nearly all of them are men of substantial means. Is it wise to decry such men as paid agitators, to denounce their leaders as discontented lawyers?[2] In past

[1] Mr. Eardley Norton, Bar.-at-law, *ibid.*, p. 26.

[2] Cf. Mr. A. P. Sen, "Education and Sedition in India,"

years I was of the Cabinet of the Congress. My official severance with that body is now complete. But I gladly pay my old colleagues the tribute of my admiration and respect for the ability, the ardour, and withal the moderation with which questions were threshed out in the Subject Committees. It was here that all the real work of the Congress was done. . . . I have lived too long behind the scenes and mixed too freely with the delegates not to be certain that they bear very willingly and very gratefully the yoke of England's rule."

§ 64. The difficulty of the sympathetic observer of the manifestations of Indian unrest is to decide with what set of conditions, real or imaginary, the present circumstances of India should be brought into comparison. The agitators and the agitated populations are alternately comparing things as they are (or more often, perhaps, things as they pretend or imagine them to be) with things as they were in the Golden Age, or with things as they will be in an impossible future. But, except in the case of a small section of the educated people, the ideal is never that of a representative democracy. Whatever they may say about England, they would never wish to copy England.

Westminster Review, August 1902: "Further, it is a noticeable fact that the Indian political movements are invariably organized and led by those who are conspicuously successful in life."

§ 65. A Mohammedan prince, H.H. the Aga Khan, puts forward the most obvious objection to the full introduction of representative institutions. "If the real power were given over to the people's representatives, how would they use it? . . . Whatever the material or educational test of the franchise, the result would be, under the present state of social civilization, that power would fall into the hands of individuals or communities who, while in many things abreast of the century, are in other things full of prejudices against the lower classes of their countrymen, unworthy of the days of the Tudors. It must not be forgotten that many of those who are demanding the highest political rights deny at this moment to their own dearest and nearest female relatives the simplest of human rights."[1]

"The great majority of the people who retain their religious beliefs and social usages" (says another native ruler[2]) "would decidedly prefer their non-representation to their *mis*-representation by those who have given up those beliefs and those usages"—and such denationalized representatives the Congress politicians would undoubtedly be.

[1] "Some Thoughts on Indian Discontent," *National Review*, February 1907.

[2] Raja Sir T. Madava Row, *Political Opinions* (Madras, 1890), p. 114.

Representative institutions have been found almost impracticable when the racial and linguistic divisions are as sharp as we find them in Austria-Hungary. The sharper religious and social divisions of India make them almost unthinkable. This, of course, is a truth which it is difficult for Englishmen to grasp. "It is apparently necessary for English politicians" (writes Sir Theodore Morison[1]) "to behold a country given up to anarchy before they can realize that popular institutions make for the disruption of a nation which is not yet compact and unified. If they looked beneath the delusive calm which the army maintains in India, they would behold all the passions which beget civil war, unscotched by a hundred years of unwilling peace." "One must be compelled" (says Dr. J. P. Jones[2]) "to deny the sincerity of many who claim that this people is a nation which prides itself upon its patriotism, so long as the caste system dominates them and their ideas. The only tie which binds together these people is the spirit of opposition to this foreign government. Among the classes and the masses there is absolutely no coherence or unity of sentiment in any line of constructive activity. So that in the matter of self-government they would prove themselves to be sadly incompetent." To mention

[1] *Imperial Rule in India*, 1899, p. 31.
[2] *India: Its Life and Thought*, 1908, p. 17.

no other objections, a representative assembly among these "children of inexorable inequality"[1] would prove unworkable, because, by jumbling together high caste and low, it would turn ceremonial Hinduism into a code of impossibilities.[2]

Representative institutions all but a small loquacious section of the people almost certainly do not want. The idea is too alien. It would be too difficult (as has been said already) to get high caste and low to sit together at the Council Board. Indeed, it is probable that to a high-caste Hindu the idea of submitting himself to the suffrages of his inferiors could only appear as an indignity. Where the representative system has been introduced obvious drawbacks appear in the working. "Sir Macworth Young, the lately retired Lieutenant-Governor of the Punjab, has recorded his opinion on the subject of the advancement in local self-government in that province in the last eighteen years, during which Lord Ripon's policy in that respect has been in force, to the effect that the people rarely manifest any interest in the election of their representatives, and the elected representatives rarely represent the real interests

[1] Mr. Justice Beaman.

[2] "The leader of this people the Brahman, is, in his way, even more haughty than the Anglo-Indian. . . . Contact with an Englishman, even with the King-Emperor himself, is for him pollution, which must be removed by elaborate and exacting religious ceremonies" (Dr. J. P. Jones, *ibid.*, pp. 22, 23).

of their constituents. If any position on the Board is coveted it is that of the nominated, not of the elected, members, and District Boards in general are merely consultative, not executive, bodies, reflecting the disposition of the Deputy-Commissioner, whose appointment as President has been necessitated in almost every case by the prevalence of party feeling and sectarian strife. The absence of a wholesome public spirit in the rural community lies at the root of this failure, and until this want is supplied local self-government in rural tracts of the Punjab will be more or less of a farce."[1] "To those who watch carefully the working of this municipal franchise" (writes Dr. Jones, an experienced American missionary[2]), "and see how easily and speedily the natives have adopted all the vices and tricks of the representative system, it does not, by any means, seem an unmixed good. And the hardest critics of the system that the writer has met have been intelligent and loyal natives, who believe that this meed of self-government is fraught with evil."[3]

[1] Mr. A. Rogers, "The Progress of the Municipal Idea in India," *Asiatic Quarterly*, April 1902. (Similar statements could, of course, be made in a description of rural England. The reader should bear in mind the difficulty of drawing comparisons in such matters with perfect justice to both populations.)

[2] "British Rule in India," *North American Review*, April 1899.

[3] In this connection should be quoted, however, the paragraph which recurs year after year in the Government's *Moral and Material Progress of India*: "The objects on which municipal

"Before the British reign" (he continues) "India had never experienced the first taste of representative institutions. To-day the query which arises in the mind of disinterested persons who know and love India is, whether political rights and liberties have not of late years been conferred too rapidly upon the people. It should not be expected that a people who, by natural taste, instinct, and unbroken heritage, are the children of the worst kind of autocratic and absolute forms of government, should acquire in an age or a century wisdom or aptitude to rule themselves. Taking the mass of Hindus, they seek no more, and seek nothing better, than a wise and kind paternal government."[1]

funds can be spent are, mainly, water supply, hospitals and dispensaries, streets and roads, vaccination, drainage, sanitation, and education. The interest in the municipal elections, and in municipal affairs generally, is not usually keen, save in a few cities and large towns; but, as education and knowledge advance, interest in the management of local affairs gradually increases. It is reported from most provinces that municipal work is fairly well done, and municipal responsibilities are, on the whole, faithfully discharged, though occasional shortcomings and failures occur in particular towns. The tendency of these local bodies, especially in the smaller towns, is to be slow in imposing additional taxes, in adopting sanitary reforms, and in incurring new expenditure. Many members of municipal bodies are diligent in their attendance to work, whether at meetings for business or on benches for decision of petty criminal cases." It should be noted also that British government is frequently accused of having destroyed the indigenous institutions for local government in the rural districts, and is said to be now, painfully and slowly, endeavouring to restore the capacities that it has itself crushed out.

[1] Sir F. S. P. Lely's homely, chatty little book, *Suggestions for*

These facts are so far recognized that Congress politicians themselves frequently disclaim any desire for the introduction of representative institutions, at least in the near future.

§ 66. Representative institutions are certainly

the Better Governing of India (1906), discusses, with many humorous illustrations, the desires and grievances of the agriculturists and their attitude towards our mechanical government. "Not only" (he writes) "are they [the British] firm and just by temperament, but their haughty aloofness from native influences makes it easier to be so in action; they are sincere, they are humane, they are as wishful to see India prosperous as her own sons are, except in some few cases where the interests of their own country are involved. . . . There comes a time, however, when even peace, justice, industry, and commerce do not satisfy. . . . The citizen is getting tired of hearing Aristides always called the Just. He sees that the 'departments' can be as ruthless as the whilom farmer of taxes; that 'the reign of law' has broken down the ancient safeguard of custom, which insured a measure of protection to all classes for many centuries; that the foreign administrator, left to himself, tends to lose the touch of sympathy and knowledge. . . . Throughout India the rising cry is, as it must be eventually in every body of sentient beings, 'Let us have rulers who know us!' . . . Perhaps no Secretariate, imperial or provincial, realizes how utterly hateful, except in large towns, is our elaborate system of laws and court machinery, especially now that time has cast a glamour over the panchayats of olden days. Of what use is the extinction of bribery if it is replaced by stamps and fees to pleaders? . . . Mr. Thorburn well remarks that if, as often happens, the familiar pathway is wrongfully closed to a ryot's ancestral field, he must be told in English that he must sue 'the dominant owner for a release of the servient heritage under chapters IV. and V. of the Easements Act.' Either the unhappy man must go to an expensive pleader to ask what all this means, or he must take the law into his own hands and so bring on himself the police and a charge of rioting before the magistrate. . . . Congress lays no stress on this, the chief of the ryot's grievances, because the system brings grist to the mills of so many of its members."

not desired by the Mohammedans of India. This fact has been evident during the controversy over the political changes introduced by Lord Morley in 1909. In 1888 Mr. Theodore Beck, Principal of Aligarh College, pointed out that "it is a very erroneous assumption to suppose that the only educated people in India are the people who have learnt English. This is certainly most untrue of the Mahomedan community. . . . It is a mistake to suppose that these men have no knowledge of politics and administration, that they never think about these subjects, and that they exert no influence on their countrymen. On the contrary, in logical thought and sound sense, their opinions often contrast very favourably with the utterances of those who are the apostles of the new school. Being the descendants of men who have governed a mighty empire, they have very distinct traditions as to the best principles of government, and the best means of captivating the affections of an Oriental people; and they criticize English measures from a very different point of view from that of Young Bengal. They have been largely utilized by the British Government in the administration of Upper India, and many of them hold important positions in the Native States. Their political thought resembles the old Tory school of England far more than the Radical, and they are by no means so enthusiastic for democratic mea-

sures as is commonly supposed by Englishmen. For example, most of them dislike the freedom of the Press, and think that it is calculated to fan the numerous race animosities of which India is a hot-bed. On the other hand, they have their own grievances, which find inadequate public utterance."[1] "It is the pride of Islam" (writes Mr. H. O. Dwight[2]) "that Divine omniscience has foreseen everything, and has provided in advance a groove, unchangeable as the laws of the Medes and Persians, in which the acts and social relations of mankind must move until the end of the world. To outgrow the provisions of such a law is impossible; to think of improving them is blasphemy. The whole of this law is prepared from the standpoint of the divinely inspired Asiatic despot, and is addressed to men whom it becomes to be fraternal in relations with one another and paternal in kindness towards a great mass of subordinates. As individuals the common people are so completely lost to view that in Arabic or Turkish or Persian the only word which can be used to express the idea of a republic means 'mob-government,' and is the one commonly used in speaking of the United States."

§ 67. One of the good results which we should expect to see follow from the spread of a sound

[1] *Essays on Indian Topics*, Allahabad, 1888, p. 42.
[2] *The Forum* (New York), May 1900.

system of education (such as could evoke a genuine sense of civic duties) would be the disappearance of racial, religious, and social barriers between the members of the educated classes, enabling them in some sort to co-operate for the good of all. It is sometimes asserted by friends of India that this fusion has already in an appreciable degree taken place. We may take the following passages as representative of this point of view:—

"The first and most obvious result of the diffusion of Western learning, and to some extent of Christianity, is the creation of a new class of men,[1] a fraternity belonging to many races, and localities, and castes, and differing much in degrees of culture, but united by common mental possessions and a common attitude, by a community of novel ideas and desires. Their

[1] The significance of this and the following quotations largely depends on the stress that we lay upon the phrase, "*creation of a new class of men.*" The University graduates, though mostly from the Brahmin caste, are forming, it would seem, something resembling a *new caste*, the distinctive mark of which, to Hindu eyes, is the neglect of caste rules. To the masses, to whom a moral life and the observance of caste regulations are interchangeable ideas, the broader outlook of the educated man can only appear as sheer lawlessness; and to this confusion of ideas is probably due much of the outcry of conservative Indians in favour of religious education. They see the breakdown of immemorial restrictions and identify it, where we should not, with a breakdown of morality. Much, therefore, of their protestations (pp. 110–112, 121–123, *supra*) may be discounted by the English reader.

English education separates them by a great gulf from the vulgar."[1]

"Indeed, it is this conviction of the simple human dignity of every man that gives the new national consciousness its strength and its nobility. It takes no account of race, religion, caste, or class, but embraces the whole population of the peninsula in the sweep of its sympathy, while all are summoned to unite in common labour to bring in the new glorious India that is to be."[2]

"Owing to the settled government of many generations and the rapid communication between province and province, India has at last become a political unity. There has been also a wide growth of religious tolerance due to the spread of education. Still further, the study of European history and English literature has awakened in many Indian minds a love of country rising above the narrower love of caste and sect. This higher patriotism has been deepened and strengthened by the spectacle of Japan.[3] They see that patriotism

[1] Mr. J. Kennedy, I.C.S., "The Tendencies of Modern Hinduism," *The East and the West*, London, April 1905.

[2] Mr. J. N. Farquhar (Professor of English, Bhawanipur), "Christianity in India," *Contemporary Review*, May 1908.

[3] References to the rise of Japan are very frequent in native papers and speeches. "A century of British education has not sufficiently awakened the national sentiment of India as the recent marvellous victories of Japan, in the Russo-Japanese war, have done" (D. S. Rama Chandra Rao, *East and West*, Bombay, Dec. 1905). "It is hard for the West to realize how much that event

can win triumphs in the East as well as in the West, and a passionate love of India has been awakened in their own hearts. This love of country is one of the noblest characteristics of the more highly educated Indians to-day. They would, I fully believe, make the greatest sacrifices to see India a united nation."[1]

But this optimistic view of the advances already achieved is bluntly rejected by most observers. "It is a curious fact," writes Mr. J. D. Rees,[2] "which Dr. Bhandarkar, amongst others, has noticed, that the caste and race spirit seems to increase with the spread of education, which, indeed, the agitators, with accustomed exaggeration, say has produced a solid Hindoo nationality. . . . The doctor says: 'In my early days all classes joined in a public movement. Now Hindoos, Mohamedans, and Parsees act independently, as do even separate castes. There is greater estrangement than existed before social reform was thought of."

Similarly, Mr. Justice Beaman:[3] "Surveying

has stirred the imagination and quickened the ambition of all the people of the East. . . . Hindus believe that the peace perfected at Portsmouth was the harbinger of a new era of liberty and independence for all the East" (Dr. J. P. Jones, *India: Its Life and Thought*, p. 5).

[1] Rev. C. F. Andrews, "The Japanese Victories and India," *The East and the West*, October 1905.

[2] *The Real India* (1908), p. 282.

[3] *Empire Review*, February 1909.

the educated classes as a whole, I doubt whether any one who really knows them would confidently say that their utility as citizens, or their morality as men, has been increased or heightened the fraction of a fraction. They have taken on a veneer of Western thought, usually of the least profitable kind; they have become fatally glib in what passes for political oratory; but they have not become more efficient in any single point of real importance. They cram themselves with democratic literature and revolutionary philosophy, but they are themselves weighted with thousands of years of inherited cast-iron conservatism. Ingrainedly and to the marrow of their bones, let them declaim as they please of liberty and equality and fraternity, they are the children of inexorable inequality. Except when posing in special rôles and for short periods, they are as much the slaves of venerated tradition, as fast bound with the fetters of caste, as they were a thousand years ago. Individual exceptions there may be, but they do not count for much in valuing the mass."[1]

Probably, also, other Englishmen in India will have shared the feeling of which I have been at times conscious—a feeling which seems to prove the all-pervading character of this world-old caste

[1] See also the slashing article by the Rev. J. A. Sharrock in the *Nineteenth Century*, September 1909.

sentiment—that it requires less moral courage to treat, with seeming unconsciousness, a high-class Indian as a social equal in the presence of the sneering type of Anglo-Indian, than it does to speak courteously to the low-caste "sweeper" in the presence of a native servant who happens to be of slightly higher social status than he.

Certainly there seems little evidence that the social barriers within the borders of Hinduism have been much affected by influences from the West. An interesting anecdote, illustrative of the point, is related by Bishop Whitehead, of Madras: "Some years ago, when lecturing at Patna, in North India, before a large audience of educated Hindus, on this subject of the brotherhood of man, I spoke for about twenty minutes in such a way as to lead my audience to imagine that I was speaking of the relations between Europeans and the natives of India. My remarks were received with loud and continuous cheering. Then I suddenly applied the principle I had enunciated to the treatment of the Pariahs by the Brahmins—the rest of my speech was received in dead silence."[1]

Reading such stories as this, one cannot but recognize the parallel—though the comparison is

[1] "The Future of Indian Christianity," *The East and the West*, January 1905.

a cruel one—with the Virginian slave-holders listening, during the agitation that preceded the revolutionary war of 1775–1782, to the words of the slave-holding orator, Patrick Henry: "Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God. I know not what course others may take, but as for me, give me liberty or give me death."[1]

Mr. H. P. Mody cites a few definite facts which have some bearing on the disputed point: "The premier Native Prince of India, a staunch Mahomedan, has for his Prime Minister a Hindu gentleman, and the enterprising Parsis have monopolized in that State some of the highest positions in the gift of the Nizam. The Gaekwar of Baroda, a devoted Hindu, and the most enlightened of all the Native Princes, has had more than one Parsi at the head of his State."[2] The action of autocratic rulers, however, is hardly

[1] A comparison between caste dominance and slave-holding is unfair to the former inasmuch as caste rests on a tyranny not of force but of opinion, a tyranny upheld, apparently, almost as much by the convictions and the acquiescence of those at the bottom as by the ingrained arrogance of those at the top. But Indian orators would do well to remember that until they give more evidence of genuine democratic feeling at home, well-informed Englishmen cannot throw themselves whole-heartedly into the work of winning for them the democratic privileges they covet for themselves.

[2] *The Political Future of India* (1908), p. 49.

indicative in such matters of the trend of popular feeling.

§ 68. Now, Sir George Chesney and similar Tory writers may exaggerate the non-representative character of the party of constitutional reform, and the cleavage of interests between section and section of the people, even as Congress itself certainly exaggerates its claim to be the voice of India. But there must be *some* truth in the Tory position; and as long as the English people at home are uncertain as to its extent, it will be impossible for us to overrule the bureaucracy and replace the English civilian by the educated native, against what *may* be both the desires and the interest of the peasantry. We would fain give the educated classes all that they petition for. But, being unconvinced, as yet we dare not.

Perhaps our best road to a partial reconciliation in theory of the two points of view is to suggest that on the one hand we have the political idealist in a hurry, the idealist who takes the long view and works towards what, if attainable at all, is bound to be best in the long run—the realization of a conception of national unity and the attainment of the full stature of political manhood—without the patience to envisage clearly the impossibility of the early achievement of that end; while, on the other hand, we have the administrator

whose prime business is to deal with short-period difficulties, to whom influences that disturb the minds of ignorant subjects, and incidentally bring on them material losses, are things to be dealt with very imperiously—the desirability of some ultimate benefit that may accrue in the distant future (as a consequence of temporary intellectual unsettlement) being naturally brushed aside as a plea of unpractical visionaries and anarchists. The aim of the higher statesmanship is to reconcile in practice, by compromises which do not stultify the aims of either contending party, the distant aspirations of the one with the paternal anxieties of the other, sacrificing neither the hope of the future to the clamant material needs of the present, nor these and other necessities of the present to the chances of visionary gain in remote centuries. Immediate efficiency and permanent prosperity must both be kept in view. Our business is certainly to rule India rather in the interest of the 299 millions than of the one million; and if, owing to caste and other religious divisions, the one million will always be socially aliens to the 299, then we must choose as administrators those who are most capable in the present for the work, regardless of nationality or colour; but if the one million is ultimately to merge into the 299 and the little leaven leaven the whole mass, then we should deal better, perhaps,

by India, if we substituted wherever we could the educated Indian for the European, regardless of temporary drawbacks.[1]

§ 69. The great political difficulty is to find some means of combining administrative institutions that will make for efficiency (especially in the interests of the inarticulate majority) with arrangements that will not destroy either the self-respect of the educated classes or their capacity for initiative. "On the moral side," says one Congress speaker,[2] "the present situation is steadily destroying our capacity for initiative, and dwarfing us as men of action." "I have often," says Sir T. Morison,[3] "been tempted to wonder whether the

[1] The above, of course, represents the attitude of the sane democratic idealist. The aims propounded would not equally meet the view of the aristocratic theorist—the believer, let us say, in the principles of Plato's Republic. If our highest hope for humanity is the full evolution of the "governing class" and the partial and one-sided development of many specialized labouring and fighting castes, then, no doubt, we should find in Indian conditions the best possible sphere for the working out of the Utopian ideal—a disinterested governing class, appearing in India almost like immigrants from another planet, chosen with special regard for their fitness to govern, and never tempted to intermarry with the people; controlling a distinctive military class also fairly separate from the populace; and a labouring population whose happy lot it is to pass contentedly through life, marrying and giving in marriage, unperturbed by fears of war and heedless of affairs of State. Few, however, are now to be classed as aristocratic Utopians.

[2] Mr. Gokhale, Presidential Address, 1905.

[3] Indian Budget Debate (quoted in the *Indian Review*, April 1904).

intellectual benefits of academic training have not in India been counterbalanced by the loss of masculine virtues; schools and colleges have diffused a new set of ideas which the people have come to value very highly, but the effect of British rule has been to keep the people at large *in statu pupillari*, in which the opportunity never occurs of deciding upon momentous issues and of taking a responsible part in grave emergencies. . . . Much of the political speaking and writing which one hears nowadays is of a kind to make one fear that such has been the case."

§ 70. The points that we have touched on, as offering the best fields for observation of the effects of Western influence on Indian life, may here perhaps be recapitulated with advantage. They are (1) the gradual recognition (as a consequence of the introduction of Western ideas of toleration and equal justice) of the disastrous nature of the racial, religious, and class antipathies that render social co-operation of all for the good of all impossible; (2) the growing realization of the evil nature of social practices, such as child-marriages and the enforcement of perpetual widowhood on girls who have lost their husbands in infancy—most of which practices are sanctified by the injunctions of religion; (3) the growth of a larger belief in the value of personality, of practical efficiency, and of social service, and the incor-

poration of these new beliefs in the ethics of the various reformed phases of Hinduism—the Brahma Samaj, the Arya Samaj, and other such schools of Westernized religious thought; (4) the dim beginnings of belief in a real evolutionary process—the possibility as well as the desirability of ethical and social progress.

§ 71. That the practical consequences of the growth of these new ideas have not as yet been very considerable must be admitted by even the best friends of the Indian; and the advances still possible, both in the field of thought and in the field of action, are immense. Patience, however, is necessary—patience on a scale that Englishmen seldom dream of—before results commensurate with our hopes can be attained. The effort of self-sacrificing courage still required before an *individual* Indian can defy his social environment by taking any step away from the lines of ancestral custom must remain, perhaps for generations, an act of the highest heroism. All honour then to those brave men who do, from time to time, break through the bonds that fetter their kinsfolk! Only as our ideas permeate whole sections of the people, and especially as they penetrate among their conservative women-kind, can such heroism become common.[1] *Group*-movements are always

[1] If it were practicable, one would like to see some one or other of the societies (Indian or English, but preferably Indian) that

conceivable, and occasionally occur. They are never thoroughly satisfactory movements; but every forward step taken makes other steps easier of achievement. "Love suffereth long and is kind"; and patiently, ever patiently, we must move forward, watching, with as little of the inevitable feelings of irritation and exasperation as may be possible for us, to seize, now here, now there, the favourable opportunity, the golden moment for consolidating the little steps of progress that one and another of these groups of our protégés may see fit to make. There are no short cuts possible. There is no room for Bismarckian methods of blood and iron. We must continue on the old mild lines, only more earnestly and disinterestedly, until—

> . . . "the seed,
> The little seed they laughed at in the dark,
> Has risen and cleft the soil, and grown a bulk
> Of spanless girth, that lays on every side
> A thousand arms and rushes to the Sun."

§ 72. In conclusion, perhaps we can best set forth the political aspirations of the saner section of Indian politicians, and their attitude towards the British Raj, by quoting from the speech delivered by Mr. Gokhale at Poona on July 4th,

work for the regeneration of India, open a "golden book" for the recording of all self-sacrificing acts of social heroism, and confer at the same time some recognized decoration—a riband of "the Legion of Honour"—in commemoration of such acts.

1909, a few days after the assassination of Sir W. Curzon-Wyllie :—[1]

"Though a certain hankering after independence must have existed here and there in individual minds from the very commencement of British rule, ideas of independence, as a factor to be reckoned with, were a growth of the last four or five years only. They had their origin in the despair which overspread the Indian mind towards the close of Lord Curzon's Viceroyalty, in the victories of Japan over Russia, and in the general feeling of protest against European domination which had sprung up, as recognized by European observers, in recent years throughout the East.

"It must be admitted that these ideas, partly owing to their natural attractiveness and partly owing to a lack of political discrimination and judgment among the people, had spread rapidly in the country, and they constituted to-day a serious obstacle in the path of the country's progress. No man, said Mr. Gokhale, could be so fallen as to think that there was any special merit in living under a foreign Government, or that there were not humiliations—at times painful and bitter humiliations—inseparable from it; but it was not a question of abstract theories or of mere sentiment—it was a question of what was practicable and what was in the best interests of the

[1] I quote from the report in the *Times of India* (Bombay).

country in the present circumstances. From that standpoint they had had to recognize two things: one was that, considering the difficulties of the position, England had done very well in India; and the second was that there was no alternative to British rule, not only now but for a long, long time to come. In view of their endless divisions, their feeble public spirit, their general lack of energy and other grave defects of national character, only madmen outside lunatic asylums could think or talk of independence. That same patriotism which in other countries had taken other forms must lead them in their situation to work loyally with the British Government for the progress and prosperity of their country. . . .

"Passing on to the political progress achievable under British rule, Mr. Gokhale said that there was practically no limit to it. Such progress had been in two directions—first, a steady obliteration of distinctions on grounds of race between individual Englishmen and individual Indians, and, secondly, a steady advance towards that form of government which Englishmen enjoyed in other parts of the Empire. . . . As regards their advance towards the goal of what might be roughly termed Colonial Self-Government, it had been urged by critics that it was unwise and even mischievous to mention such a goal since it could not

concern the present or the near future. The speaker, however, did not share that view. He thought it was most useful and most important that they should be able to say to their countrymen that in the fullness of time they could hope to attain under British rule a form of government worthy of the self-respect of civilized communities. Moreover, those who spoke of such a goal spoke of it not to suggest what their countrymen might immediately ask for or the Government could be expected to grant, but to keep before their minds an idea of what they had to qualify themselves for. For the whole question after all was a question of character and capacity and qualification. They must realize that their main difficulties were in themselves. The present Hindu-Mohammedan agitation had drawn the pointed attention of everybody to the absence of any real unity in the country, and had shown how deep and wide the fissures were. Their average character and capacity would have to be considerably raised before they could hope to bear the responsibilities of any real measure of self-government."

Mr. Gokhale is pre-eminently the representative of the Hindu community. Let us set beside his remarks the words of a representative Parsi, Sir Pherozeshah Mehta, K.C.I.E. :—[1]

[1] Speech delivered as Chairman of the Reception Committee of Congress, Bombay, December 1904.

"We truly and earnestly respond to the words in which Lord Curzon adjured us the other day on his landing: 'I pray, I pray the Native community in India to believe in the good faith, in the high honour, and in the upright purpose of my countrymen.' Gentlemen, it is because we do sincerely believe in that good faith, in that high honour, and that upright purpose, that we meet here in the open light of day to appeal to their noble and righteous impulses, by all lawful and constitutional means, so to discharge the sacred trust reposed in them by Providence, that it may redound to the glory and greatness of both countries. . . . May we pray in return that when we ask to be allowed to co-operate in this noble task, Lord Curzon and his countrymen will believe that we, too, of the Congress, are inspired by duty, patriotism, and loyalty."

And finally, beside these words of Hindu and Parsi, let us place a few sentences from an outstanding exponent of Mohammedan sentiment—His Highness the Aga Khan, G.C.I.E. :—

"This phenomenon in itself, this clinging of all to some dream of connection with England, shows that there is no really insuperable difficulty, if the matter were dispassionately considered, in bringing an end to the discontent. Race instinct is not the dividing line. And since it is possible for England to possess the affection of her Indian

subjects, is it not worth her while at whatever cost —except, of course, honour and safety—to win that love to which she has so many splendid claims?"[1]

§ 73. To sum up. The educational system of India is, even from the extreme secularist point of view, unsatisfactory and inadequate; and its products (like the educational products of other lands and other systems) are no more above criticism morally than they are intellectually. But we cannot expect perfection. We have no right to expect it. And—to quote Mr. Gokhale again[2]—"the greatest work of Western education in the present state of India is not so much the encouragement of learning as the liberation of the Indian mind from the thraldom of old-world ideas, and the assimilation of all that is highest and best in the life and thought and character of the West. For this purpose not only the highest but all Western education is useful. . . . Englishmen should have more faith in the influence of their history and their literature. And, whenever they are inclined to feel annoyed at the utterances of a discontented B.A., let them realize that he is but an incident of the present period of transition in India, and that they should no more lose faith

[1] "Some Thoughts on Indian Discontent," *National Review*, February 1907.

[2] Speech in the Vice-regal Council on the Universities Bill, December 1903.

in the results of Western education on his account than should my countrymen question the ultimate aim of British rule in this land because not every Englishman who comes out to India realizes the true character of England's mission here."

Moreover, the men who have been dealt with by our system are subjected to exasperating personal disabilities, and to peculiarly strong temptations to play on the political stage a rôle which does not make for lasting benefit to their fellow-countrymen. But even if their intellectual attainments were remarkably high, and they themselves as disinterested as human nature permits, their path of duty would by no means lie plain and open before them. The problems of their political future are complicated as the political problems of few countries are complicated. There is no simple programme of reform for either the politician or the educationist; and if amid the gloom of political confusion, of religious unrest, of social perplexities, those who are pressing eagerly forward take, now and again, a wrong turning, it is not for lookers-on, whose lots are cast on happier lines, to condemn as failures the products of what must inevitably remain a system of compromise.

INDEX

Aga Khan, 141, 150, 192, 215
Ahmad Khan, Sir Syed, 78, 125, 179
Ali, Ameer, 77, 125, 150
Ali, Yusuf, 17, 54, 89
Aligarh, 78, 79, 170
Andrews, C. F., 107, 134, 202
Anglo-Indians, influence of, 139–41, 183
animals, consideration for, 52 *n.*
Arya Samaj, 2, 53, 117, 210
asceticism, 36–41, 53

Baboo English, 65 *n.*
Baines, J. A., 15, 17, 48
Banerjea, 166
Baroda, 17
Beaman, 96, 173, 184, 202
Beck, T., 143, 198
Bengal, partition of, 149, 176–8
Bernard, Sir Chas., 73
Bhabha, 76, 78
Bhandarkar, 202
Bhownaggree, 96
Bible-reading in schools, 81–3, 108
Birdwood, Sir G., 100
Birmingham, Bishop of, 41
Blake, Sir H., 170
Bombay, Bishop of, *see* (1) Mylne, (2) Southampton
Bonnerjee, W. C., 189
Brama Samaj, 2, 53, 56, 117, 210
Buddhism, 52
Buddhist schools, 115–16
Bukhsh, S. Khuda, 125
Burma, education in, 114–16

caste, 15, 39, 49, 180 *n.*, 194 *n.*; economic aspects of, 23–5, 47, 48; ethics of, 43–7; political consequences of, 173, 180 *n.*, 205 *n.*; breakdown of, 25, 200–6; caste and women, 48
Central Hindu College, 78
Chandi, K. K., 152
Chesney, Sir G., 180, 184 *n.*
Christianity, influence on Hinduism, 2, 117–18, 140, 163, 200–6; in relation to Indian patriotism, 106–9
civics, 154–6, 169–172
civil service, 19, 181–3, 197 *n.*; examinations, 170–1
Colvin, 134
compulsory education, 17 *n.*
compulsory religious teaching, 74–6, 77 (*see* also Bible-reading)
Congress, character of, 158, 161–2, 168–73, 208–9; methods, 159–63, 185–6, 191; policy 161–6, 186–91; motives, 175, 185–6, 189, 197 *n.*; representative character of, 159, 175–76, 179–84, 191 *n.*, 192
Coomaraswamy, 64
Cotton, Sir H., 143
Cox, Sir E. C., 147
Craik, Sir H., 94
criminal statistics, 8
Cromer, 7, 10, 114
Cumming, C. L. B., 81
Curzon, 18, 49, 50, 60, 61, 83, 90, 130, 183, 212, 215

Dahlke, P., 40
Dar, B. Narayan, 112
Deas, G. F., 35
debt, native propensity to, 26
denominational teaching, 74–83
Duncan, D., 60, 70, 73, 74, 76, 82
Dwight, H. O., 199

education; elementary, 16, 17, 90; of women, 49; extent of secularization, 57–60, 69–73; effects of secularization, 110–22; average cost, 94; education and employment, 94–105; conciliatory function of, 151–6; Indian attitude towards, 62–7; difficulties of educational reform, 18, 61–2 *n.*
Elibank, Master of, 29
ethics and religion, 3, 4, 35, 77, 120–1 (*see* also Hindu ethics)
examinations, 63–9; civil service, 170–1 *n.*

famines, 20, 29
Farquhar, J. N., 27, 163, 201
Fraser, Sir A., 78, 138
Fraser, A. G., 108, 121, 123, 170
Frere, Sir H. B., 56
Fuller, Sir Bampfylde, 14, 20, 188

Ghose, Lal Mohan, 62
Giles, E., 131
Gokhale, G. K., 183, 208, 211–14, 216
graduates, statistics of, 69, 104; occupations of, 94–101, 176 *n.*; character of, 110–13, 117–37, 149, 152–54
Groïs, N., 175.

Hewett, Sir J., 29
Hinduism, influence of Christianity upon, 2, 3, 117–18; popular Hinduism, 49
Hindu ethics, 3, 4, 5, 6, 35–47
Holland, W. E. S., 92
hostels, 61, 78 *n.*
Hunter, Sir W. W., 121, 128, 162

India, 177
Indian Daily News, 162
Indian Sociologist, 166
indigenous schools, 57–8, 122–3

Jains, 52
Japanese, Indian admiration for, 89, 201, 212
Johnston, J., 98
Jones, J. P., 26, 29, 37, 44, 47, 140, 182, 193, 194 *n.*, 195, 196, 202 *n.*

Kantavala, 17
karma, 40–2, 45
Kashmir, Maharajah of, 98
Kennedy, J., 2, 34, 51, 53, 58, 78, 108, 117, 140, 201
Kirk, K. E., 151

Laddu, 4
Lal, Parameshwar, 87
Lee-Warner, 153, 155
Lely, Sir F. S. P., 52, 153, 184, 196–7
Lethbridge, Sir R., 101
local government, 55 *n.*, 194–6
Longridge, 35, 112
Lucas, B., 38, 45
Lyall, Sir A., 42
Lytton, 79, 156 *n.*

Macaulay, 93, 110
Macdonnell, Sir A. P., 79
Maclean, J. H., 42
Macnicol, N., 15, 50, 51, 54, 153
Maconachie, 111, 138
Madhava Rao (*or* Row), Sir T., 27, 134, 188, 192
Madras, Bishop Whitehead of, 5, 41, 58, 71, 72, 111, 204
Malthus, 169
Mehta, Sir P., 159, 214
memory training, 64, 65, 93

Mill, J. S., 151, 119
Miller, W., 171
mission schools, 70, 72, 73, 92, 114–16, 137–8
Mitra, S. M., 98, 123, 152, 172
Mody, H. P., 39, 149, 205
Mohammedans, 11, 32, 39, 108, 113, 125, 179–80, 198–9; Mohammedan universities, 78–81
Morison, Sir T., 9, 32, 77, 78, 89, 97, 108, 136, 152, 154, 155, 185, 188, 193, 208
Morley, 177
Morrison, J., 108
Mozoomdar, 138
municipal institutions, 55, 195–6
Mylne, L. G., 33, 35, 43, 112
Mysore, 76

Natarajan, 17
nationalism, 173–5, 186, 200–3 212–16; relation of Christianity to, 106–9
newspapers, *see* vernacular press
Nisbet, J., 99
Norton, E., 161, 190

Oakley, E. S., 35
Oldfield, J., 139.

pantheism, 5, 32–8
Paranjpye, 117
Parsis, 39
pessimism, Indian, 27, 28, 30, 34
police, 8, 9 *n.*, 172 *n.*
population, distribution of, 14; mobility of, 23; poverty of, 18–27; progress of, 28–30, 134–5, 153–4
proselytism, 71, 76, 83, 108, 113, 115

Qadir, Shaikh Abdul, 104, 149
Quraishi, 80

Ranchi, 78
Rao, D. S. R. Chandra, 201
Rao (*or* Row), Madhava, 27, 134, 188, 192
Rau, K. Srinivasa, 55
Rees, J. D., 111, 149, 202
representative institutions, 180–9, 192–9, 206–9
Ripon, 101
Roy, Krishna Chandra, 98

Sanskrit schools, 57 *n.*, 123
Sastri, S. N., 127
Sastri, V. S. S., 72
Satthianadan, S., 137
savings banks, 26
Sayce, 12
secularization, *see* education.
sedition, discussion of, 144–51, 166–9, 171–3 (*see* also Unrest).
Selby, F. G., 94, 101–102
Sen, A. P., 169, 190
Sen, Keshub Chunder, 56
Setalvad, 18
Sharp, H., 65
Sharrock, J. A., 62, 180, 203
Singh, Sirdar, Arjan, 22
Slater, T. E., 124
Smith, A. P., 9
Southampton, Bishop of, 139 178, 179
Spiller, 77
Stoicism, 38
students, character of, 67, 87–90, 126–38; home surroundings, 85, 86, 102, 126; attitude towards education, 62–7 (*see* also graduates).
Subrahmanyam, T. V., 176
Sundaraman, 76
Sundararamaiya, 80
superstition, 51

taxation, 16, 18, 19, 161
technical education, 104, 105
text-books, 65, 68, 69, 70, 84, 119, 127, 151–5
Thorburn, S. S., 86, 97, 98, 158, 197
Times of India, 187
transmigration, 40–2, 45

Trinity College, Kandy, 170
Trivedi, Utamlal, 62

Universities described, 60–6, 68–70, 91
Universities Act, 61, 88, 176, 179
Unrest, causes of, 51, 94–103, 139–41, 147–57, 166–81, 188–91

Vambéry, 136
vernacular press, 97, 153 *n.*, 156–7, 159, 172
villages, 14, 15, 54; village schoolmasters, 65 *n.*

Wagle, N. B., 111
Welinkar, N. G., 154, 155
Welldon, J. E. C., 10, 81, 134
Whitehead, *see* Madras.
Wilson, Sir A., 112
Wuttke, 36

yoga, 64
Young, Sir M., 194

WILLIAM BRENDON AND SON, LTD.
PRINTERS, PLYMOUTH

BOOKS ON INDIA.

A HISTORY OF BRITISH INDIA. By Sir WILLIAM WILSON HUNTER, K.C.S.I, M.A., LL.D.

Vol. I.—Introductory to the Overthrow of the English in the Spice Archipelago, 1623. With 4 Maps. 8vo, 18s.

Vol. II.—To the Union of the Old and New Companies under the Earl of Godolphin's Award, 1708. 8vo, 16s.

HISTORY OF THE INDIAN MUTINY. 1857–8. By Sir JOHN W. KAYE and Colonel G. B. MALLESON. With Analytical Index and Maps and Plans. 6 vols. Crown 8vo, 3s. 6d. each.

A STUDENT'S MANUAL OF THE HISTORY OF INDIA. By Colonel MEADOWS TAYLOR, C.S.I. Crown 8vo, 7s. 6d.

BOMBAY IN THE DAYS OF GEORGE IV. Memoirs of Sir EDWARD WEST, Chief Justice of Bombay during the Conflict of the King's Court with the East India Company. With hitherto unpublished documents. By F. DAWTREY DREWITT, M.A., M.D. 8vo, 9s. 6d. net.

HISTORICAL ATLAS OF INDIA. For the use of High Schools, Colleges, and Private Students. By the Rev. FR. JOPPEN, S.J. 26 Coloured Maps and a Plate. 3s. net.

A NARRATIVE OF INDIAN HISTORY. For High Schools. By J. C. ALLEN. With numerous Illustrations, Maps, and Plans. Rs. 1–8.

THE HISTORY OF INDIA. By HEMLOTA DEVI. With 41 Illustrations and Maps (18 in colours). Price One Rupee.

LONGMANS' SCHOOL HISTORY OF INDIA. By G. U. POPE, M.A., D.D. 2s. 6d.

LITTLE RAJA'S PRIMER OF INDIAN HISTORY. By G. U. POPE, M.A., D.D. 1s.

EPOCHS OF INDIAN HISTORY.

Edited by JOHN ADAM, formerly Principal of Pachaiyappa's College, Madras, and Fellow of the Madras University.

ANCIENT INDIA, 2000 B.C. to 800 A.D. By R. C. DUTT, C.I.E., Fellow of the University of Calcutta. With 2 Maps. 2s. 6d.

THE MUHAMMADANS, 1001–1761 A.D. By J. D. REES, C.I.E., Fellow of the University of Madras. With 3 Maps. 2s. 6d.

LONGMANS, GREEN & CO., 39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.
NEW YORK, BOMBAY, AND CALCUTTA.

BOOKS ON INDIA.

A HANDBOOK TO AGRA AND THE TAJ, SIKANDRA, FATEHPUR-SIKRI AND THE NEIGHBOURHOOD. By E. B. HAVELL, A.R.C.A., Principal, Government School of Art, Calcutta; Fellow of the Calcutta University. With 14 Illustrations from Photographs, and 4 Plans. Crown 8vo, 5s. net.

MISSIONS TO HINDUS: a Contribution to the Study of Missionary Methods. By LOUIS GEORGE MYLNE, M.A., D.D., Rector of Alvechurch, Worcestershire; Bishop of Bombay, 1876–97, sometime Tutor of Keble College, Oxford. Crown 8vo, 3s. 6d. net.

TALES OF BENGAL. By S. B. BANERJEA. Edited by FRANCIS HENRY SKRINE, Indian Civil Service (Retired). Crown 8vo, 3s. net.

A series of sketches illustrating home life in our most advanced Indian province. They cast a flood of light on the complex Bengali character, and display the practical results of British Administration as it affects the masses. The editor's task has been mainly one of adaptation for Western readers; but the author tells his own story in language which is simple and redolent of the soil. Mr. Banerjea opens entirely new ground, and his volume will give Englishmen some insight into the causes of the existing unrest.

RECOLLECTIONS OF A LUCKNOW VETERAN, 1845–1876. By Major-General J. RUGGLES, Colonel 19th Punjabees. 8vo, 5s. net.

THE MASTER AS I SAW HIM: being pages from the Life of the Swami Vivekananda. By his Disciple NIVEDITA, of Ramakrishna-Vivekananda, &c. Crown 8vo.

AN INDIAN STUDY OF LOVE AND DEATH. By the SISTER NIVEDITA, of Ramakrishna-Vivekananda. Crown 8vo, 2s. net.

CRADLE TALES OF HINDUISM. By the SISTER NIVEDITA (MARGARET E. NOBLE). With Frontispiece. Crown 8vo, 5s. net.

WORKS BY PROFESSOR F. MAX MÜLLER.

INDIA: What can it Teach Us? Crown 8vo, 5s.

RÂMAK*RI*SHN*A*: his Life and Sayings. Crown 8vo, 5s.

THE ORIGIN AND GROWTH OF RELIGION, as illustrated by the Religions of India, 1878. Crown 8vo, 5s.

THE SIX SYSTEMS OF INDIAN PHILOSOPHY. Crown 8vo, 7s. 6d. net.

LONGMANS, GREEN & CO., 39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.
NEW YORK, BOMBAY, AND CALCUTTA.

WITHDRAWN

THE UNITED LIBRARY
3 5560 001 041 534

DATE DUE

LOGICAL SEMINARY
BRARY
ON, ILLINOIS